



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

A KING AND RULER TAKES HIS STAND
‘Herod’ as a Composite Character in Luke-Acts

Frank E. Dicken

Submitted in Satisfaction of the Requirements for the
Degree of Ph.D. in the University of Edinburgh
November 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	ii
Abstract	iii
Signed Declaration	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Abbreviations	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: The Herods in Lukan Literary Scholarship	11
Chapter 3: Methodological Considerations.....	32
Chapter 4: From Herodian Dynasty to Composite ‘Herod’	63
Chapter 5: A King and Ruler Takes His Stand: Composite ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts ...	96
‘Herod’ and John the Baptist.....	119
‘Herod’ and Jesus	129
‘Herod’, the Apostles, and the Early Church	170
Chapter 6: ‘Herod’, Satan’s Authority, and the Proclamation of the Gospel	181
Chapter 7: Conclusion.....	229
Bibliography.....	235

ABSTRACT

Using a narrative-critical approach, this thesis argues that ‘Herod’ may be construed as a composite character in Luke-Acts. Composite characters appear in literary works as a conflation of two or more historic individuals into a single character in a narrative. Scholars have often noted that Luke-Acts evidences a more extensive interest in the Herodian rulers than do the gospels of Mark and Matthew and that each of these rulers are depicted similarly to the others in his work. However, no one has argued that those rulers named ‘Herod’ may be understood as a composite character.

In Luke-Acts, three Herodian rulers stand behind the composite ‘Herod’. The thesis will show that when compared/contrasted with what is known about the Herodian rulers from historical evidence, two unique features of the depiction of the Herodian rulers named Herod in Luke-Acts emerge. First, at Luke 1:5 the author uses the title ‘King of Judaea’ which is unattested elsewhere for any Herodian ruler. Second, at Acts 12 the author uses the name ‘Herod’ for Agrippa I, a name that finds no external corroboration for this particular King. While other occurrences of the name ‘Herod’ refer to Herod Antipas (Luke 3—Acts 4), these two distinct features of the narrative may be understood as conflation of the other ‘Herods’ with Antipas. Following an interpretation of all the passages in which ‘Herod’ appears, it will be evident that ‘Herod’ is portrayed consistently and as a single character not only through repeated use of the name ‘Herod’, but as a recurring antagonist to the key protagonists of the narrative (John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles/early church). Finally, the thesis will consider as explanation of the depiction of ‘Herod’ how this composite character embodies Satanic opposition from the political realm toward those who proclaim the gospel in the Lukan narrative.

SIGNED DECLARATION

I hereby affirm that I have composed this thesis of approximately 86,650 words and that the work is my own. I have not submitted the work for any other degree or professional qualification.

Frank E. Dicken

Candidate

Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Submitting a Ph.D. thesis for examination is not a solitary process, despite the delusions of the researcher. A moment's reflection brings to mind the many people who have assisted and supported the candidate through the years of reading and writing. As I arrive at the final stages of this process, I want to pause here and thank several of them.

I begin by thanking the numerous friends I have made at New College over the past few years. Our conversations, both serious and not so serious, have made my time in Edinburgh much better than I could have imagined. To the folks with whom I shared the Semples study space, thanks for putting up with me and laughing sometimes. Special thanks goes to Sean Adams, not only for his friendship, but his generosity with his personal library. To the guys with whom I shared the flat at Rue Mandar in Paris – Lonnie Bell, Seth Ehorn, Jason Radcliff, and Corey Williams – thanks for late nights on the curb during July 2011. Those memories and your continuing friendship are priceless.

Thanks to Jason LeCureux, Eddy Sanders, and Dave Hershey for discussions about topics as important as Scripture, politics, and the NFL. I offer special thanks to good friends, Blair and Laura Wilgus, for helping me and Jill make a smooth transition from the U.S. to Edinburgh. Blair, thanks also for two years of Friday afternoon laughter, despite the heart attack scare and the chronic health problem I have because of it.

I want to thank those professors who have challenged me to do my best over the years, especially Kevin Larsen, Robin Underhill, Robert Lowery, Michael Gorman, Steve Fowl, and Chris Skinner. Your friendship and instruction have helped to hone my abilities and played a huge role in my accomplishments.

I must also thank the family – the Dickens of Virginia, the Sacketts, the Ryans, and the Bates – for the love, encouragement, and support you have given me and Jill from across the pond. In particular, thanks to my father-in-law, Chuck Sackett, who read nearly every word of what follows, proofreading and helping me better organise my thoughts. And thanks especially to my mom, Sharon Dicken, whose prayers and love are felt in many more ways than she knows.

There are two ladies who deserve special mention. First is *meine Doktormutter*, Helen Bond. I cannot imagine working with a better doctoral supervisor. Your comments on my work over the past few years have proved invaluable and encouraging. Saying thanks here is insufficient for everything you have done to help me arrive at this point. I hope you know that you have been and will be appreciated.

Last, but by no means least, is my wife, Jill. I know that moving to another country and starting over (again) was not ideal, but your love and sacrifice have not been taken for granted. The experiences we have shared over the past few years have been incredible. For making that happen, and for so much more, this study is dedicated to you.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AB</i>	Anchor Bible
<i>ABR</i>	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
<i>AGAJU</i>	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
<i>AJP</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>ALUOS</i>	<i>The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt
<i>ANTC</i>	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
<i>BDAG</i>	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3 rd ed., ed. by Frederick William Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000)
<i>BECNT</i>	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
<i>BETL</i>	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BT</i>	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
<i>BW</i>	<i>The Biblical World</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>BZNTW</i>	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CRBS</i>	<i>Currents in Research Biblical Studies</i>
<i>CRINT</i>	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
<i>EKK</i>	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar
<i>ExpT</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>GPet</i>	Gospel of Peter
<i>HNT</i>	<i>Handbuch zum neuen Testament</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>

<i>HTS</i>	Harvard Theological Studies
<i>ICC</i>	International Critical Commentary
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>The Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSNTSS</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series</i>
<i>JSOTSS</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series</i>
<i>JSPSS</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LN</i>	<i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains</i> , ed. by Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989)
<i>LNTS</i>	Library of New Testament Studies
<i>LSJ</i>	Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9 th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
<i>LTPM</i>	Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs
<i>LUOSMS</i>	Leeds University Oriental Society Monograph Series
<i>LXX</i>	Septuagint
<i>NIB</i>	The New Interpreter's Bible, ed. Leander Keck, <i>et al</i> (Nashville: Abingdon Press)
<i>NIBC</i>	New International Biblical Commentary
<i>NICNT</i>	New International Commentary on the New Testament
<i>NIGTC</i>	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NPNF</i>	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church
<i>NT</i>	New Testament
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>

<i>OGIS</i>	<i>Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae</i> , ed. Wilhelm Dittenberger (Lipsiae: S. Hirzel, 1903)
<i>OT</i>	Old Testament
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>ProtoJam</i>	Proto-evangelium of James
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>RestQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>RevBib</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
<i>RTL</i>	<i>Revue Théologique de Louvain</i>
<i>SBEvT</i>	<i>Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology</i>
<i>SBLDS</i>	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
<i>SBLMS</i>	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
<i>SecCent</i>	<i>The Second Century</i>
<i>Sem</i>	<i>Semeia</i>
<i>SJSJ</i>	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>SNTSMS</i>	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>SNTSU</i>	Studien zum neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
<i>SNTW</i>	Studies of the New Testament and its World
<i>SP</i>	Sacra Pagina
<i>SupNovT</i>	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
<i>TENTS</i>	Texts and Editions for New Testament Study
<i>TNTC</i>	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
<i>TPINTC</i>	TPI New Testament Commentaries
<i>TSAJ</i>	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>WBC</i>	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WUNT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum neuen Testament
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

Chapter 1: Introduction

In a letter written to Pontius Pilate, Herod expresses his grief over three unfortunate incidents: spilling the blood of so many children,¹ beheading John the Baptist, and conspiring with the Jews to have Jesus executed.² Herod writes that he and his family are suffering various punishments as recompense for his crimes. His daughter, Herodias, while playing on a frozen pond, fell through the ice and her head was severed. Herod's wife grieves, holding their daughter's head on her lap, and has been struck with blindness in her left eye. He goes on to state that his son is in anguish and near death. Herod himself is not exempt from punishment as he writes that he is wracked with grief, suffering from dropsy, and has worms coming out of his stomach.

This letter, an obvious forgery, is found in a Syriac manuscript that dates to the sixth or seventh century CE.³ It is somewhat surprising to read of Herod grieving

¹ B. Harris Cowper, *The Apocryphal Gospels and Other Documents Relating to the History of Christ*, 4th ed. (London: Frederick Norgate, 1874), 392, n. 3; J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 224. Spilling the blood of children clearly reflects the slaughter of innocents ordered by Herod the Great and recorded in Matt 2:16-18. This, presumably, reflects the Syriac text of the document since the Greek text presented by Montague Rhodes James, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, vol. 5, Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897), 68 indicates that Herod's father is responsible for the slaughter, stating πολλήν γὰρ ῥύσιν αἵματος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τέκνων ἀλλοτρίων ὁ πατήρ μου ἐποίησεν διὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

² The manuscripts also contain a letter from Pilate to Herod in which the Roman governor expresses his grief over having sent Jesus to his death. There is a tendency in the early Christian period to shift blame for Jesus' death from Pilate and the Romans to Herod and, even more so, the Jewish people which is also evident in this particular writing. On this tendency see J. K. Elliott, ed., *The Apocryphal Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 89.

³ James, *Apocrypha*, 5: xlv. The Syriac manuscript is held at the British Museum (Add. 14,609 ff. 120a-122a). A Greek manuscript dating to the fifteenth century (Cod. Gr. 929) is held at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. James presents the Greek text with English translation on pp. 71-75. Cowper, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 389-397 offers an English translation based on the Syriac text. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 222-224 gives a very brief introduction as well as a translation.

over his responsibility for the deaths of John the Baptist and Jesus given his depiction in the synoptic gospels as an opponent of John and Jesus. What is most interesting is Herod's statement that as part of his punishment he has worms coming out of his stomach. Anyone familiar with the gospels and Acts knows that the Herod who suffered with worms in his stomach in Acts 12:20-23 was not the same Herod who executed John the Baptist and participated in the trial and crucifixion of Jesus. In the words of B. Harris Cowper, this is 'a palpable anachronism'.⁴

How could a Christian author, especially one with clear knowledge of the documents of the NT and writing at a relatively early date make such a mistake?⁵ The Herod who executed John the Baptist⁶ and is implicated in the death of Jesus by the author of Luke-Acts⁷ was Herod Antipas, son of Herod the Great and Tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea from 4 BCE to 39 CE. The Herod who died with worms coming out of his stomach was Agrippa I, King of the Jews from 41 to 44 CE.⁸ The author of the *Letter of Herod to Pilate* certainly is guilty of *historical* anachronism, but perhaps there is another explanation as to why the author depicted Herod in this way.

As an alternative explanation, the 'Herod' of this letter is a composite character. A composite character is an amalgamation of multiple historic people that appears as a single character in a literary work. The letter of Herod to Pilate evidences this phenomenon: Herod appears as a single individual in the letter, but it is obvious that Herod Antipas and Agrippa I are conflated into the individual

⁴ Cowper, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 392, n. 3.

⁵ Ibid., 389 sets the date of composition ca. 400 ce.

⁶ Cf. Mark 6:14-29; Matt 14:1-12; Luke 3:19-20; 9:9 and Jos. *Ant.* 18.116-119.

⁷ Cf. Luke 23:6-12; Acts 4:27.

⁸ The accounts of Agrippa's death are found in Acts 12:20-23; Jos. *Ant.* 19.343-352.

purporting to compose the letter.⁹ To explain, any later reference to Herod's responsibility for Jesus' death in a Christian text is likely dependent upon Luke-Acts in some way as this *Doppelwerk* contains the earliest such accusations (Luke 23:6-12; Acts 4:25-27). Also, the author of Luke-Acts is the only witness from antiquity of the name 'Herod' for Agrippa I (Acts 12:1-23). Whoever composed *The Letter of Herod to Pilate* knew Luke-Acts (and the Gospel of Matthew) and drew on the traditions contained therein to create his or her own composite 'Herod'.

Statement of Thesis

As its contribution to NT scholarship, this thesis will argue, based on a narrative critical methodology, that 'Herod' can be construed as a composite character in Luke-Acts.¹⁰ I will demonstrate that understanding 'Herod' as a composite is possible by noting two unique features in the depiction of the Herodian rulers in Luke-Acts. Let me be clear: I do not disagree that these Herods are three different *historical* people. This very fact undergirds my argument: a composite character is a conflation of two or more historic individuals. Instead, I will demonstrate that these Herods can be understood as a single character named 'Herod' within the *narrative* of Luke-Acts.

⁹ Herod the Great may also be part of this amalgamation depending on which reading of the slaughter of innocents one prefers.

¹⁰ Throughout the thesis, the name 'Herod' will appear in quote marks when I am referring to composite 'Herod'. When I refer to a historical Herodian ruler outside the narrative of Luke-Acts (e.g., Herod the Great, Herod Antipas, etc.) or discuss other scholars' work on the Herods, the name will appear without quote marks.

As we will see in chapter three below, composite characters appear in ancient texts as a way to represent and illustrate a stereotypical theme or themes in the writings. Composite ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts is no different and I will explore ‘Herod’s’ embodiment of political opposition toward the protagonists of Luke-Acts as an outworking of Satanic attempts to hinder the proclamation of the gospel in chapter six. Accordingly, ‘Herod’s’ death in the narrative (Acts 12:20-23) is one way Luke indicates that political/Satanic opposition cannot impede the spread of the good news.

Overview of the Thesis

In the next chapter I will review the pertinent works of scholarship that approach the Herodian rulers in Luke-Acts with a narrative-critical methodology. The three key works are John Darr’s *Herod the Fox*,¹¹ O. Wesley Allen’s *The Death of Herod*,¹² and chapter five of Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom’s *The Roman Empire in Luke’s Narrative*.¹³ In addition to these three monographs, I will present the state of scholarship on the Herods of Luke 1:5 and Acts 12 as the distinctive features in narrative depiction of ‘Herod’ in these two passages (namely, the title ‘King of Judaea’ at Luke 1:5 and the use of the name ‘Herod’ for Agrippa I in Acts 12) are crucial in my argument that ‘Herod’ is a composite character. We will see that

¹¹ John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*, JSNTSS 163 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

¹² O. Wesley Allen, Jr., *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS 158 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).

¹³ Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom, *The Roman Empire in Luke’s Narrative*, LNTS 404 (London: T & T Clark, 2010).

though many scholars discuss these unique features of Luke's presentation of the Herodian rulers (even to the point of noting Luke's close alignment of the various Herods through his repeated use of the name 'Herod'), they typically seek historical rather than narrative solutions to the problems posed by these two texts. In other words, scholars have not explained these features of Luke's narrative in the same way that this thesis does – that 'Herod' is a composite character.

Chapter three will outline the methodological parameters of the thesis. The methodology adopted for this project is narrative-critical. The approach taken here is essentially that of Robert Tannehill in his two-volume narrative commentary on Luke-Acts.¹⁴ This method proceeds from the assumption that Luke-Acts comprises an integrated, narrative whole and notes the thematic connections throughout the narrative.¹⁵ I will also discuss an approach to characterisation based on ancient literary conventions and modern scholarly discussions of the matter. I will conclude the chapter on methodology by listing several examples of composite characters in

¹⁴ Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1990). Tannehill's analysis ultimately involves the perspective of the implied author and narrator (*Luke*, 7), whereas the present thesis will focus on the author's intent as revealed in the text. Though Tannehill wishes to distinguish between the real and implied authors of Luke-Acts, I see little distinction between the two as the basis for analysis in either case is the text of the documents itself.

¹⁵ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: xiii, 3. See also Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, SBLMS 20 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), 7. This methodological choice also represents a key difference between the present thesis and the works of Darr and Yamazaki-Ransom noted above. As I will explain, Darr's method is to read Luke-Acts in light of Luke's extratextual repertoire, specifically the literary convention of 'charismatic versus ruler' found in Hellenistic literature ('prophet versus king' in the Hebrew Bible/LXX). Darr examines Herod Antipas as a character over against John the Baptist and Jesus in light of this convention. In doing so, he reconstructs a hypothetical reader's first reading of Luke-Acts, showing how that reader builds the character of Herod as s/he progresses through the works. Herod, for Darr, is a paradigm of negative response to God's prophets. In this way, the author shows the reader that a response to John and Jesus that differs from Herod's is required. Yamazaki-Ransom chooses to examine Luke-Acts in light of a heuristic device that he dubs the 'triangular model'. He constructs this device based on the relationship between God, Israel, and foreign dominating powers as they are described at points in the Hebrew Bible and LXX. He then analyses the Roman rulers who appear in Luke-Acts, including the Herodian rulers, in light of this model.

the Hebrew Bible, LXX, early Christian writings, and Rabbinic works. These examples will show: 1) composite characters are a feature of literature contemporaneous with Luke-Acts and 2) it is possible to identify a character as a composite by discerning that more than one historic individual stands behind the character.

The relationship between the historical Herodian rulers and Luke's composite 'Herod' will be the subject of chapter four. There I will offer a brief biographical sketch of each of the Herods who stand behind Luke's 'Herod'. These sketches will incorporate information on the Herods drawn from ancient literary works and epigraphic/numismatic discoveries, with the chief sources being Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews* and *The Jewish War*. A brief excursus will discuss how Josephus' personal biases and objectives affect his portrayal of the Herodian rulers. After presenting a biographical sketch of each of the Herods who stand behind Luke's 'Herod', my ultimate aim will be to compare and contrast the narrative portrayal of 'Herod' in Luke-Acts with what is known about the Herods in other texts and archaeological evidence in order to highlight the two distinctive features at Luke 1:5 and Acts 12: the title 'King of Judaea' at Luke 1:5 (along with the chronological difficulties presented by Luke 2:1-2) and the appearance of the name 'Herod' for Agrippa I in Acts 12. These two adaptations provide the impetus for seeing 'Herod' as a composite in Luke-Acts. First, at Luke 1:5 the title 'King of Judaea' for a Herodian ruler finds no external attestation in any literary or epigraphic sources. In order for there to be a composite character we must be able to identify this Herod as a different *historic* individual than the other Herods, but not as a distinct character in the Lukan *narrative*. This is problematic as the historic

identification of the Herod of Luke 1:5 is uncertain.¹⁶ However, historical inquiry will show that this Herod is either Herod the Great or his son, Archelaus, and therefore distinguishable historically from the other Herods (Antipas and Agrippa) of Luke-Acts. What makes conflation of this Herod with the others possible is Luke's use of the titles 'King' and 'Tetrarch' interchangeably, the overlap between the terms 'Judaea' and 'Galilee' in Luke-Acts, and the repeated use of the name 'Herod' throughout the narrative. This final observation leads to the second distinctive feature of the depiction of the Herods in Luke-Acts, the use of the name 'Herod' for Agrippa I in Acts 12. This name finds no attestation outside of Acts for Agrippa I. In this case, I will argue that the appearance of this name for this ruler makes conflation of the Herods possible.

Having highlighted the distinctive features in the narrative depiction of the Herods in Luke-Acts, which lend themselves to understanding 'Herod' as a composite character, chapter five turns to the narrative of Luke-Acts itself. The aim of this chapter will be to offer an exegesis of the passages in which 'Herod' appears in order to show: 1) the consistent characterisation of 'Herod', i.e., that 'Herod' may be read as a single character and 2) that this character is an antagonist over against three of his primary protagonists: John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles/early Church.¹⁷ I will begin with an analysis of Acts 4:25-27 in order to provide the internal evidence of the depiction of 'Herod' as a representative king *and* ruler. I will

¹⁶ The historical problem centres not only on the unique title, but also Luke's inclusion of the census under Quirinius as the backdrop for the birth of Jesus (Luke 2:1-2).

¹⁷ The exceptions will be Acts 12:20-24 and 23:35 which I will discuss in chapter six as these passages illustrate the themes discussed there. The reference to 'Herod's' Praetorium at Acts 23:35 leads us to an examination of Paul's trial before Agrippa (Acts 25:13—26:32), not because the narrative indicates a family relation between 'Herod' and Agrippa (it does not), but because Luke portrays Agrippa in ways that are comparable to his depiction of 'Herod'.

argue that this passage is the programmatic summation of the role of 'Herod' in the narrative as it recalls not only 'Herod's' involvement in the trial and execution of Jesus but also, more subtly, the ruler's execution of John the Baptist via the narrative alignment of Jesus with John. The text is also proleptic, anticipating 'Herod's' persecution of the church, particularly the apostles James and Peter. After this analysis of Acts 4:25-27, I will return to the characterisation of 'Herod' in relation to each of the protagonists. This discussion of the depiction of 'Herod' will reveal in full what the analysis of Acts 4:25-27 showed in summary, i.e., that 'Herod' is a king and ruler who has taken his stand against the Lord and the Messiah.

Chapter six will situate composite 'Herod' in the cosmic conflict between the devil and God envisioned in the Lukan narrative by showing that 'Herod's' actions may be explained in terms of Satanic opposition to the spread of the gospel to the end of the earth. In order to accomplish this, I will note that the proclamation of the gospel to the end of the earth is a central theme in Luke-Acts (cf. Acts 1:8). John the Baptist initiates this proclamation, which Jesus continues in the third gospel and the apostles and other disciples carry it out in the Book of Acts. Next, I will explore two features of the portrayal of Satan that relate directly to 'Herod': 1) the devil's rule over the kingdoms of the earth (cf. Luke 4:5-6) and 2) Satan's attempts to hinder the proclamation of the gospel. These facets of the portrayal of Satan provide a framework for interpreting 'Herod's' reign as king and ruler as well as his antagonism toward the protagonists, which stems from his ruling under the authority of the devil. Though the narrative depiction of the devil casts the entire earthly ruling

power in Luke's narrative in a negative light,¹⁸ 'Herod's' actions exemplify an extreme-negative: namely, that political persecution, including imprisonment and even execution, may come upon those who participate in proclaiming the good news. However, opposition such as that envisioned by composite 'Herod' cannot hinder the continued progress of the gospel.

To make this evident with regard to 'Herod', I will return to Luke-Acts and two final passages in which composite 'Herod' appears. Acts 12:20-24, the narrative of 'Herod's' death, demonstrates that though political persecution may come upon the church just as it had come upon John the Baptist and Jesus (cf. Acts 12:1-5), such persecution will not stop the progress of the gospel as the story concludes with the plain statement that the word of God grew and multiplied (Acts 12:24). Second is the narrative of Paul's trial before Agrippa which takes place at 'Herod's' Praetorium in Caesarea (Acts 23:35; 25:13—26:32). The setting is 'Herod's' final appearance in the narrative. This setting, along with the portrayal of Agrippa in ways that are remarkably similar to 'Herod' (though Agrippa is *not* part of the composite character), provide an ominous tone to the entire narrative that anticipates Paul's imminent death.¹⁹ However, Paul does not die. Rather, Agrippa finds Paul innocent and sends him to Rome, ostensibly because Paul has appealed his case to Caesar but actually because Paul was informed by the Lord that he must testify in Rome (Acts 23:11). Therefore, these two passages demonstrate narratively that though political opposition is a reality that those who proclaim the gospel may face, it will not hinder

¹⁸ I.e., the Roman political system envisioned by Luke 2:1-2; 3:1-2 and the repeated references to Caesar in Acts.

¹⁹ Acts 20:25-26, 38 also anticipate Paul's death.

the geographic spread of the good news to the end of the earth. In chapter seven, I will summarise the argument and offer two implications prompted by this thesis.

In an essay published in 1978, Joseph Fitzmyer pondered why Luke would have Herod ask the crucial question, τίς δέ ἐστιν οὗτος περὶ οὗ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα; (Luke 9:9) and wrote that determining what role Herod plays in the larger narrative would solve the quandary.²⁰ John Darr states that he was prompted to write *Herod the Fox* as a response to Fitzmyer's question.²¹ Similarly, a statement made by Darr in his discussion of Acts 4:23-31 prompted the present thesis. He writes, 'Soon another Herod (King Agrippa I) will "lay hands on and mistreat" members of the Church (Acts 12:1)...The lesson is clear: if one chooses to be a true witness – one who sees, hears, responds and tells – the one will inevitably encounter a "Herod"'.²² Darr is on to something here, something with which the present thesis will grapple. My argument will be that Luke's witnesses do not encounter *a* Herod, but instead, in the narrative of Luke-Acts the protagonists encounter 'Herod', a composite character who embodies Satanic opposition toward their efforts to preach the good news to the end of the earth.

²⁰ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, 'The Composition of Luke, Chapter 9,' in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. by Charles H. Talbert (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978), 151, n. 42.

²¹ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 11.

²² *Ibid.*, 207–208.

Chapter 2: The Herods in Lukan Literary Scholarship

When one begins a scholarly investigation of the Herodian rulers, one quickly learns that historical concerns rule the day.¹ Since this thesis is a literary investigation of the Herods in Luke-Acts, works of historical scholarship will be supplemental to this study in two ways. First, insofar as they offer interpretations of the biblical texts, I will utilise and evaluate them in the exegetical sections below (though their contribution in this regard will be minimal). Second, I will draw on these historical works in my biographical sketches of the members of the Herodian dynasty who figure in Luke-Acts (chapter 4) which will provide points of comparison and contrast to the narrative of Luke-Acts, thus helping us discover the distinctive features of Luke's presentation of the Herods and showing us how Luke has constructed composite 'Herod'. However, since they are historical works, an extensive review of these works here would offer little justification for the current project.²

¹ The key works of historical scholarship include Nikos Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty*, JSPSS 30 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); Abraham Schalit, *König Herodes: der Mann und sein Werk*, 2. Auflage mit einem Vorwort von Daniel R. Schwartz (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001); Samuel Rocca, *Herod's Judaea: A Mediterranean State in the Classical World*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 122 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Morten Hørning Jensen, *Herod Antipas in Galilee*, WUNT 215 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Harold W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas: A Contemporary of Jesus Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980); F. F. Bruce, 'Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea,' *ALUOS* 5 (1963): 6–23; Daniel Schwartz, *Agrippa I: The Last King of Judaea*, TSAJ 23 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990); Peter Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996); Michael Grant, *Herod the Great* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971); Stewart Perowne, *The Life and Times of Herod the Great* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Inc., 1957); Stewart Perowne, *The Later Herods* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Inc., 1958); A. H. M. Jones, *The Herods of Judaea* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938). The writings of Josephus will be evaluated and drawn upon as well.

² Tamar Landau, *Out-Heroding Herod*, AGAJU 63 (Leiden: Brill, 2006) presents a major study of Herod the Great as a character in the writings of Josephus in light of several rhetorical features of Hellenistic literature. Landau's monograph is a thorough literary investigation, but since an entirely different corpus is the basis for Landau's study, it is of ancillary import to the current thesis.

Rather, literary investigations that treat the Herods as characters in Luke and Acts concern us here. I will first provide an overview of the theses, methodological parameters, and key contributions of three works that approach the Herods as characters in Luke-Acts. Then I will proceed by providing an overview of scholarship on Luke 1:5 and Acts 12:1-23 as these two passages are crucial to my argument of ‘Herod’ appears as a composite character. This overview will provide an understanding of how scholars normally treat these passages concerning the Herods as characters. This will allow me to justify the current project by demonstrating the scholarly contribution to be made in this area of New Testament studies by understanding ‘Herod’ as a composite character in Luke-Acts.

Literary Approaches to the Herods in Luke-Acts

John Darr, *Herod the Fox*³

John Darr’s two monographs, *On Character Building*⁴ and *Herod the Fox*, are landmark studies regarding characterisation in Luke-Acts. While the former contains a chapter on Herod Antipas, it is the latter work which expounds upon the methodology propounded in the former and expands the analysis of Herod Antipas as a character in Luke-Acts in order to illustrate that method.

Darr is explicit about his purpose for writing *Herod the Fox*, ‘...it is largely methodological, defining and arguing for a particular way of reading and interpreting

³ John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*, JSNTSS 163 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

⁴ John A. Darr, *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992).

characters in Luke-Acts'.⁵ As he states, the specific issue he addresses arose from a question first posed by Joseph Fitzmyer in his essay in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*,⁶ 'what is the role of Herod in Luke-Acts as a whole?'.⁷ Darr, in six chapters, outlines his methodology and applies it in answering Fitzmyer's question by examining the texts in Luke-Acts that refer to Herod Antipas.

In the introductory chapter, Darr highlights the problem noted by Fitzmyer: what is the role of Herod as a character in Luke-Acts as a whole? Darr believes that three implications arise from this question: 1) Luke changes the Markan material regarding Herod and adds episodes which are unique to the third gospel, 2) the real problem is literary in nature, i.e. the issue must be addressed with literary-critical tools and not historical-critical tools, and 3) the lack of a full-scale treatment of Herod's role as a character in Luke-Acts is a lacuna in scholarship that Darr seeks to fill.⁸

Darr outlines his methodology in chapters two through four. His methodology includes an examination of contemporary literary theory, characterisation in particular, with a view to understanding how a first-time reader of Luke-Acts would have understood Herod's depiction and role in the narrative. Chapter two is Darr's interaction with literary theory, but begins by stating his own assumptions very clearly: 1) literature has a rhetorical function, to influence readers,

⁵ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 7.

⁶ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, 'The Composition of Luke, Chapter 9,' in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. by Charles H. Talbert (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978), 139–152.

⁷ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 11. Darr's inquiry concerns Herod Antipas, but as he notes the name 'Antipas' is never used in Luke-Acts so he uses only the name given in the text, Herod.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 12.

2) the meaning of a text emerges as it is read, and 3) the historical and cultural milieu of a text remains significant for its later interpretation.⁹ Next he outlines the theories of Wayne Booth (implied author/reader), Wolfgang Iser (both the text and the reader determine meaning), Stanley Fish (a reader ‘creates’ both the text and the meaning in the process of reading), and post-structuralism (not even the text is an objective reality). Darr sides with both Booth and Iser in that he seeks to apply a method that considers ‘the dynamic interaction between text and reader in the process of reading’.¹⁰ Darr notes four factors required for his consistent appropriation of this methodology: 1) the literary and social world of the first century, 2) insights gleaned from source and redaction criticism, 3) a limitation of his inquiry to Luke-Acts, and 4) the construction of an imaginary, hypothetical first-time reader.¹¹

Darr focuses on the issue of characterisation and explains his own approach to this matter in chapter three. Concerning characterisation in Luke-Acts, Darr assumes ‘the integrity of the entire two-volume work’ and that characters must be interpreted ‘in light of the whole text *as actualized to a particular point by the reader*’.¹² In other words, Darr goes about the task of characterisation by positing the information regarding a character that his hypothetical first-time reader gathers as s/he works through the text in a linear fashion. With each occurrence of a particular character in the text (Herod in this case), the hypothetical reader adds to what s/he has already come to know about that character from the preceding narrative. At the

⁹ Ibid., 35.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., 62.

¹² Ibid., 68.

end of the narrative, the reader has fully constructed the character. Darr contends that this fully-formed character is one way that the author of Luke-Acts helps the reader grasp the stated purpose of the work, ‘so that you might know about the things which you have been taught with certainty’ (Luke 1:4).¹³ He also states that the responses of characters in Luke-Acts to Jesus are illustrative literary paradigms that show the reader appropriate and inappropriate responses to Jesus.

In chapter four Darr explains the ancient literary motif of interactions between charismatics and rulers. Hellenistic authors exemplify these figures in showdowns between philosophers and tyrants. The purpose of these scenes was to demonstrate the philosopher’s commitment to his convictions, to showcase his teachings, to vindicate him and, at times, to teach the reader. In the LXX this literary convention takes the form of confrontations between prophets and kings.¹⁴ Specifically, Darr outlines several features of the prophet versus king motif in the LXX (in his opinion, Luke’s primary literary influence along with the second gospel): the prophet is always the protagonist, the king is always assessed negatively, the confrontation occurs when the word of the Lord comes to the prophet, the prophet then condemns the ruler and spells out the consequences of the king’s actions, the message is often accompanied by signs that validate the prophet’s credentials, the king and his advisors typically respond with hostility, and the

¹³ Ibid., 61–62.

¹⁴ Ibid., 101–136. As for Hellenistic examples, Darr cites Perigrinus’ desire to confront Caesar (though the desire is thwarted as Perigrinus was expelled from the city, the people still praise Perigrinus as a hero), Apollonius of Tyana before Emperor Domitian, Diogenes before Alexander the Great, and Secundus keeping his Pythagorean vow of silence before Hadrian. LXX examples of confrontations include ‘Moses-Pharaoh; Samuel-Saul; Nathan-David; Elijah-Ahab; Micaiah ben Imlah-Ahab; Isaiah-Ahaz; Jeremiah-Johoiakim; and Jeremiah-Zedekiah’ (131).

prophet's oracle is fulfilled.¹⁵ This motif, as part of Luke's extratextual repertoire,¹⁶ provides the parameters for Darr's understanding of Luke's depiction of Herod over against John the Baptist and Jesus in Luke-Acts.

In chapters five and six Darr applies his method to the scenes in which Herod (Antipas) appears in Luke-Acts. These two chapters are largely exegetical and I will interact with them extensively in my interpretation of Luke's depiction of 'Herod' below (chapter five and part of chapter six). At this juncture, suffice it to say that I agree with many of Darr's conclusions regarding Luke's portrayal of Herod in Luke 3—Acts 4, but my analysis of 'Herod' as a composite character will necessarily include Luke 1:5; Acts 12:1-23; 23:35.

However, there are fundamental differences between Darr's work and the current thesis. First, and most significant, whereas Darr examines the role of Herod *Antipas* as a character in Luke-Acts, I will be arguing for the Lukan construction of composite character built around the name 'Herod', which amalgamates three different historic individuals whom Luke portrays as a single character in his narrative. Darr does note the problem of the single name 'Herod' for both Antipas and Agrippa I in Luke-Acts.¹⁷ As I explain in the next chapter, I will be capitalising on the continuity created by this single name that Luke uses not only for Antipas and Agrippa I, but also for either Herod the Great or Archelaus at Luke 1:5. This

¹⁵ Ibid., 132–135. Darr notes that it is not necessary to find all of these features in every prophet versus king narrative for the motif to be present.

¹⁶ Ibid., 97–100. This repertoire also included a general awareness of the major literary works of the Greco-Roman period and a familiarity with Roman politics and Roman interaction with subjects (but not necessarily an awareness of minor political rulers, e.g. Herod and Pilate), the geography of Palestine and Jewish culture and idiosyncrasies.

¹⁷ Ibid., 11, 207–208.

continuity provides the impetus for understanding ‘Herod’ as a composite character. Second, Darr’s methodological approach to Luke-Acts is reader-oriented, specifically reconstructing a hypothetical reader’s initial reading of Luke-Acts from beginning to end in which that reader collects information about a character provided by the text and constructs that character in relation to the protagonists.¹⁸ As I will explain in the next chapter, my approach to the narrative is text and author-oriented, noting unique features of the author’s portrayal of ‘Herod’ and highlighting thematic and structural patterns that contribute to Luke’s characterisation of ‘Herod’. Third, and also related to methodological matters, Darr applies an extratextual motif (charismatic versus ruler/prophet versus king) to his understanding of Herod Antipas as a character in Luke-Acts. I do not deny that such an extratextual literary motif is useful for an analysis such as Darr’s, but I do not apply any such motif to my understanding of ‘Herod’. Instead I choose to focus exclusively on the text of Luke-Acts and highlighting the contrasts between the portrayals of the Herods outside Luke-Acts and Luke’s portrayal of ‘Herod’ in order to show the presence of a composite character. Finally, there is one way the present thesis will assess ‘Herod’s’ interactions with Luke’s protagonists differently than Darr has. Darr rightly demonstrates that Herod Antipas represents a paradigm of negative response to John the Baptist and Jesus for his first-time reader. In chapter six I will place ‘Herod’s’ rejection of the gospel and those who proclaim it in a larger Lukan framework, namely the cosmic conflict between God and Satan envisioned in the Lukan narrative. For the present thesis, ‘Herod’ is an exemplar of political persecution and

¹⁸ Ibid., 35.

his negative response both to the good news and those who preach it results from his ruling under the authority of the devil.

O. Wesley Allen, *The Death of Herod*¹⁹

This volume, a revision of Allen's Emory University dissertation, seeks to present a 'comprehensive narrative reading' of Acts 12:19-24 in several logical steps.²⁰ First, Allen examines other death of tyrant type-scenes in classical literature in order to place Acts 12:19-24 in that literary milieu (chapter two). He then sets this smaller pericope in its immediate context (Acts 12) showing how Luke utilises it to provide a narrative conclusion the persecution that began in Acts 12:1. Allen continues his analysis of Acts 12 as a whole by comparing the two type-scenes found in this chapter (the death of a tyrant and the escape from slavery/prison) with the Exodus narrative of the LXX, thereby demonstrating how the death of the tyrant following a release from slavery/prison brings closure to oppression and persecution (chapter three). Next, Allen places these findings within the context of the entire Lukan narrative, viewing them in light of previous examples of divine retribution in Luke-Acts (e.g., Judas' death after his betrayal of Jesus or Saul's blinding during his persecution of the church) and pointing out the transitional role each act of retribution plays in the narrative (chapter four). In chapter five, Allen returns to Luke's wider Hellenistic literary context to place Acts 12:19-24 along other

¹⁹ O. Wesley Allen, Jr., *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS 158 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 24.

narratives of retribution in the apologetic historiographies of Diodorus of Sicily, Dionysius of Halicarnasus, and Josephus.

I will draw on Allen's work below, particularly in the discussion of 'Herod' in Acts 12. However, the differences between his work and the current thesis should be apparent. Most significantly, Allen's is not a work of characterisation, but instead an exegetical and theological study of Acts 12:19-24 undertaken in light of intertextual allusions and extratextual literary conventions. Also, Allen treats the Herod of Acts 12 as a distinct character, whereas the current thesis will show that this Herod may be understood as the same character, 'Herod', who appears elsewhere in the narrative. Furthermore, Allen interprets the narrative of Acts 12:19-24 in light of the larger Lukan theological theme of retribution with the goal of demonstrating how stories of retribution in Luke-Acts serve a transitional role in the narrative. Therefore, while Allen's work will prove useful in my interpretation of Acts 12, his work is an exercise in comparative literature, intertextual allusion, and theological inquiry and as such, differs substantially from this thesis.

Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom, *The Roman Empire in Luke's Narrative*²¹

This monograph combines two aspects that the current thesis will address: a narrative methodological approach to Luke-Acts and, to a lesser extent, the role of the Roman Empire in Luke's thought. Yamazaki-Ransom's project is to discuss how Luke redefines 'the idea of the people of God...by redefining the opponents of the

²¹ Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom, *The Roman Empire in Luke's Narrative*, LNTS 404 (London: T & T Clark, 2010).

people of God'.²² He adopts a 'historically informed narrative-critical approach to Luke-Acts'.²³ His method focuses on the literary features of the texts under consideration, examining Luke-Acts as a unified whole that is 'an end in itself' (and not a historical reconstruction of information behind the text). He bases his reading in the models of communication offered by speech-act theory²⁴ and reads Luke-Acts in light of a reconstructed extratext.²⁵ Since he is analysing the appropriation of Jewish texts in Luke-Acts, the intertextual relationship between Luke-Acts and the Hebrew Bible/LXX (particularly quotations and allusions) plays a large role in Yamazaki-Ransom's argument. His argument proceeds from the development of two heuristic models drawn from his readings of the LXX. He dubs these models the 'binary' and 'triangular' models and utilises them to illustrate the relationship between God and the people of Israel without a foreign dominating power (binary model) and the relationship between God and the people when a foreign power is ruling (triangular model).²⁶

Yamazaki-Ransom reads Luke-Acts in light of his triangular model with the dominating power, Rome, portrayed as part of Satan's kingdom (cf. Luke 4:5-6). He argues that Luke redefines the people of God as all who respond to the gospel in faith, both Jew and Gentile.²⁷ The Lukan narrative envisions this redefined people of

²² Ibid., 3.

²³ Ibid., 6.

²⁴ Ibid., 5. Yamazaki-Ransom relies on Mark Allen Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 7–9 for his definition of speech-act theory with regard to texts. Powell sees texts as communicative acts with an author/sender, a text/message, and a reader/recipient.

²⁵ Here, Yamazaki-Ransom admits his reliance on Darr, *Herod the Fox*.

²⁶ Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, ch. 2. In his models there are varying degrees of nuance. For example, the triangular model may function harmoniously with the Gentile ruler(s) giving due reverence to the God of Israel. Or, the opposite may be true.

²⁷ Ibid., ch. 3, especially 102-105.

God embodying an anti-imperial ideology known as the Kingdom of God. Within this framework, Yamazaki-Ransom systematically analyses Luke's depiction of Roman governors and the Herodian rulers who appear in the narrative.²⁸ He offers four conclusions to his study. First, he believes that though Luke's depiction of various Roman rulers is mixed (some positive, some negative), Luke's overall attitude toward the Roman Empire is negative because of its alignment with the authority of Satan in the narrative.²⁹ Second, he concludes that Luke portrays the Jewish rulers negatively, not because they are Jews but because they do not believe in Jesus.³⁰ Third, he states that both the canonical OT and Jewish literature of the second Temple period form the Jewish literary background against which Luke-Acts must be read. Luke's appropriation of this literature via allusion and intertextuality must be evaluated in Christological terms. Fourth, Yamazaki-Ransom concludes that since Luke's purpose is to redefine the people of God, we may understand the genre of Luke-Acts as a foundation narrative.³¹

As for the Herodian rulers in particular, Yamazaki-Ransom treats them separately from other Roman rulers and as distinct characters, though he sees Luke's depiction of each of them as mutually informing.³² For Yamazaki-Ransom, the Herods are mediators between Rome and Israel, aligning with both the other Roman rulers as well as the Jewish religious leaders in Luke's narrative.³³

²⁸ Ibid., chs. 4-5.

²⁹ Ibid., 201-202.

³⁰ Ibid., 202.

³¹ Ibid., 203.

³² Ibid., chap. 5.

³³ Ibid., 163-164.

Yamazaki-Ransom briefly describes Luke's portrayal of Herod Antipas, Agrippa I, and Agrippa II concluding that Luke depicts both Antipas and Agrippa I as Gentile rulers in the triangular model.³⁴ Agrippa II, on the other hand, fits Yamazaki-Ransom's triangular model, but he states that the focus of the narrative lies not in the ruler's relationship to the people of God but rather to God himself. In this way, Agrippa II is 'the least negative figure among the Herods in Luke-Acts' as he does not persecute Christians and does not mock Paul.³⁵

The relation of Yamazaki-Ransom's monograph to the current thesis is clear, especially its narrative focus and his chapter on the Herodian dynasty. Broadly, my thesis will, like Yamazaki-Ransom's, employ a narrative-critical methodology that treats Luke-Acts as a unified narrative, accounting for the aesthetics of the text itself. With regard to the Herods in particular, we agree that the Herods *as rulers* are part of the 'Roman imperial dominion' (and, as such, part of Satan's dominion over the created order as Luke 4:5-6 indicates)³⁶ and that there is a remarkable degree of similarity in Luke's depiction of the Herods. Although Yamazaki-Ransom's approach to the Herods is fundamentally different from the one adopted in this thesis, I will agree below with many of his conclusions (which he presents in a much more condensed fashion than I will) about Luke's depiction of the Herodian rulers.

However, this thesis will differ in several important ways. First, the fundamental difference is that Yamazaki-Ransom treats each of the Herods as a

³⁴ Ibid., 174, 185. He states that Agrippa I is the clearest example of this because he is the only ruler who explicitly persecutes Christians.

³⁵ Ibid., 195. I will disagree with Yamazaki-Ransom on this last point concerning the King's mockery of Paul.

³⁶ Ibid., 202.

distinct ruler, whereas I will be arguing that ‘Herod’ may be construed as a single character.³⁷ Second, Yamazaki-Ransom’s methodological approach is different from the one adopted here. His methodology centres on intertextuality and a proposed heuristic model for construing the relationship of the people of God to the ruling powers. The methodology of the present thesis (chapter three below) is *intra*-textual, examining features of the narrative of Luke-Acts itself that result in the construal of a composite character and how that character illustrates and embodies key themes of the literary work. Third, Yamazaki-Ransom’s aim differs from mine. While I will agree that Luke depicts the authority of the Roman Empire and its rulers as deriving from the devil, Yamazaki-Ransom utilises this feature of Luke’s narrative primarily to offer an assessment regarding Luke’s view of the Empire, whereas I will utilise this as a starting point to explain Luke’s depiction of composite ‘Herod’. These differences in methodology and results warrant the current thesis.

Preliminary Conclusion: Literary Approaches to the Herods in Luke-Acts

It is now apparent that the current thesis addresses a different matter than these three monographs, namely how we may construe Luke’s ‘Herod’ as a composite character. As I will demonstrate, two Lukan anomalies are the impetus for viewing ‘Herod’ as a composite: the person behind the name ‘Herod’ is ambiguous at Luke 1:5 and Acts 12:1-23 is the only attestation from antiquity of the name ‘Herod’ for Agrippa I. These two anomalies have been addressed in various ways by scholars, but not in the way that I am proposing.

³⁷ Ibid., 165, 196–198.

As a general statement, scholars writing on Luke and Acts (or Luke-Acts) show a bias toward historical inquiry. This is understandable since Luke and Acts are documents that purport to be about things that happened (τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ὑμῖν πραγμάτων, Luke 1:1) and historical-criticism still rules the day in biblical scholarship. However, I again point out that this thesis is a *literary* investigation focused on a particular literary phenomenon, a composite character. At this juncture we only need to review how scholars have dealt with the key issue that pertains specifically to my construal of composite ‘Herod’. Since everyone agrees that the Herod of Luke 3—Acts 4 is Herod Antipas, the Tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea from 4 BCE – 39 CE,³⁸ my argument will rest on being able to demonstrate that we can include the ‘Herod’ of Luke 1:5 and Acts 12 (both of whom are demonstrably *not* Herod Antipas) with the ‘Herod’ of Luke 3—Acts 4 in our understanding of ‘Herod’ as a composite character in the whole of Luke-Acts.

With regard to Luke 1:5, scholars generally assume that Luke’s ‘Herod, King of Judaea’ refers to Herod the Great and therefore, is a different character than the other Herods in Luke-Acts.³⁹ Even Darr distinguishes between the Herods of Luke

³⁸ Also Acts 13:1, though Barbara Reid, ‘Women Prophets of God’s Alternative Reign,’ in *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, ed. David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee (Eugene: Pickwick, 2011), 46 believes that ‘Herod the Tetrarch’ at Acts 13:1 is Agrippa II (Acts 25:13—26:32).

³⁹ This is likely due to conflation of Luke and Matthew’s birth narratives. For those who identify this ruler as Herod the Great see, e.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, AB 28 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), 306; Luke T. Johnson, *Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 32; Francois Bovon, *Luke I*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002), 33; Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 72.

1:5 and 3:1 by appealing to the different titles βασιλεύς and τετράρχης.⁴⁰ In chapter four I will argue that ‘Herod, King of Judaea’ is ambiguous as no Herodian ruler ever held this particular title (and to a lesser degree, because of the chronological issues surrounding Quirinius’ census). I will also argue that the titles ‘King’ and ‘Tetrarch’ are interchangeable and do not necessarily serve as ways to distinguish between characters.⁴¹ Additionally, ‘Judaea’ and ‘Galilee’ are not clear geographic designations in Luke-Acts, but rather, are overlapping terms that refer to the same place at times (cf. Luke 23:5; Acts 10:37). This all contributes to the ambiguity surrounding the specific person *behind* the text that is necessary for understanding a character as a composite.⁴² As for the depiction of ‘Herod’ as a character at Luke 1:5, given that ‘Herod’ plays no actual role in the Lukan birth narrative, scholars do not discuss ‘Herod’ as a character in Luke 1-2. In contrast, I will show below that the appearance of ‘Herod’ as the first character in the narrative sets the king up as a rival to Jesus (the true King in the Lukan narrative) and prepares for ‘Herod’s’ role as opponent of John the Baptist.

Scholars do, however, discuss the Herod of Acts 12 as a character, as we have seen in our review of the three monographs above. Two issues arise from Acts 12 that are pertinent for this thesis. First is the anomalous use of the name ‘Herod’ for

⁴⁰ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 140–141. Again, this is due to methodological differences between Darr’s work and the current thesis. J. Duncan M. Derrett, ‘Further Light on the Narratives of the Nativity,’ *NovT* 17 (1975): 83–84, 97 and Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 226–227, n. 78, because of the chronological problems created by the reference to Quirinius’ census in Luke 2:1, believe that Luke 1:5 refers to Archelaus, son of Herod the Great (cf. Matt 2:22), in their attempts to preserve an internally consistent Lukan narrative. While they accomplish that goal, the point that scholars believe that the Herods of Luke 1:5 and 3:1 are different people still stands.

⁴¹ Cf. Matt 14:1, 9.

⁴² This matter is the focus of in my comments on the methodological parameters employed in this thesis in the next chapter.

Agrippa I. Second, the Lukan portrayal of the Herod of Acts 12 accords with his portrayal of the other Herods in the narrative. Scholars have noted both of these features in the narrative, primarily to show a parallel between Jesus and Peter. Some scholars even come close to what I will argue is an understanding of ‘Herod’ as a composite character, but still distinguish between the Herods. Let us look more closely at these features concerning Acts 12 in scholarship.

The works of Darr and Yamazaki-Ransom (examined above) draw attention to the similarities in Luke’s portrayal of the various Herods in his narrative. Darr, near the conclusion of his discussion of Acts 4:23-31, notes that ‘another Herod’ will soon arise in Acts to persecute the church, namely King Agrippa I, but pursues this line of inquiry no further.⁴³ Yamazaki-Ransom notes the ‘close relationships’ in the Lukan depiction of the various Herodian rulers including the use of the name ‘Herod’ as well as the antagonism of Antipas and Agrippa I toward Jesus and Peter respectively.⁴⁴ He goes on to state that ‘Luke’s portrayal of any Herodian ruler must not be read in isolation but within the larger framework of the Herodian dynasty in Luke-Acts’,⁴⁵ with the various Herodian rulers forming ‘a *group* that constantly opposes God and his people.’⁴⁶ Regarding the appearance of the name ‘Herod’ in

⁴³ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 207–208. Darr’s comments here are somewhat puzzling as he specifies that the Herod of Acts 12 is King Agrippa and, in noting the parallels between Jesus’ passion and Paul’s trial, refers to King Agrippa as ‘King Herod.’ To be fair, Darr’s project is an illustration of a particular reader-response methodology, but it must be noted that in making these distinctions, he fails to allow the text of Luke-Acts to dictate the terms of the narrative analysis. Instead, in Acts, Agrippa I is *only* named ‘King Herod’, an appellation ‘King Agrippa’ (i.e., Agrippa II) never receives.

⁴⁴ Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 196–197. Compare Antipas’ and Agrippa II’s cooperation with Roman governors and their respective failures to release Jesus and Paul (both of whom were found to be innocent).

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 197–198. Yamazaki-Ransom’s comment that Luke depicts Antipas, Agrippa I, and Agrippa II differently from each other is puzzling since he only highlights the similarities in their portrayals (p. 196).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 197, emphasis mine.

Acts 12 for Agrippa I, Yamazaki-Ransom states that this allows Luke to align Agrippa with both Antipas and Herod the Great (Luke 1:5).⁴⁷ He does not see a composite character though. These two scholars point out some of the overlap in the Lukan depiction of the various Herodian rulers in the narrative, but still maintain that there is a distinction between the characters.

Several other scholars have noted the high degree of similarity in Luke's portrayal of the Herods to which both Darr and Yamazaki-Ransom refer. Some have noted the similarity in view which revolves around the recurrence of the name 'Herod' for Agrippa I at Acts 12, for which there is no other epigraphic or literary evidence attestation in antiquity.⁴⁸ Ernst Haenchen states in his comments on Acts 12:1, 'For the Christian reader the very title "King Herod" supplied the prince's motive for persecution: "King Herod" had to be an enemy of the Christians!'⁴⁹ Haenchen believes that there are early Christian traditions lying behind Luke's 'King Herod' at Acts 12:1, but in the same note makes the historical distinction between Herods that is common to commentators, 'Herod Agrippa I is meant, the grandson of Herod the Great (born 10 B.C., died A.D. 44)...'.⁵⁰ Tannehill also comes close to seeing Herod as a composite when he writes in his comments on Acts 12, 'Readers of Luke-Acts, in the first century as well as the twentieth, should be pardoned if they think that this is the same Herod who killed John the Baptist and was ominously

⁴⁷ Ibid., 196.

⁴⁸ Schwartz, *Agrippa I*, 120 and 120, n. 50; Allen, Jr., *Death of Herod*, 7, n. 9; Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 196; Richard I. Pervo, *Acts*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 303.

⁴⁹ Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 381, n. 2.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

interested in Jesus'.⁵¹ However, Tannehill seems to revoke his pardon of the readers in a footnote, 'The narrator does distinguish them to this extent: the later Herod is a tetrarch (Luke 3:1, 19; 9:7; Acts 13:1), while the Herod of Acts 12:1 is a king.'⁵² Further, writing about the role of Herod Antipas in the passion narrative, Tannehill notes the parallel experiences at the hands of political rulers of Jesus and John the Baptist on the one hand, and those of the early church on the other, but states that two different Herodian rulers are involved.⁵³ At this point, we note that Tannehill, the exemplar of a narrative approach to Luke-Acts, differentiates the Herods. Similarly, Richard Pervo, also commenting on Acts 12, states,

'King Herod' is a folkloristic wicked tyrant, comparable to the baby-killing Herod the Great (Matt 2:16-18) or, more relevantly, to his prototype, the Pharaoh of Exodus, or to the prophet-beheading 'King Herod' of Mark 6:14-29 (who was not a king)...The appellation 'Herod' will do for any Jewish ruler, particularly for those who are bad.... It is not certain that otherwise uninformed readers would keep all of these figures distinct.⁵⁴

Though Pervo is close to my understanding of 'Herod' as a composite character, his comments regarding Herod in Acts 4:25-27 are telling. In those comments he states that Luke depicts the Herod of Acts as a monarch, like Herod in the gospel of Mark but unlike the Herod of the third gospel.⁵⁵ This demonstrates that he makes the same distinctions between the Herod of the third gospel and the Herod of Acts that others

⁵¹ Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1990), 152.

⁵² Ibid., 2:152, n. 2. This is interesting given that the first occurrence of the name 'Herod' in Luke-Acts appears with the title 'King' (Luke 1:5). We will deal specifically with the issue of the various titles for 'Herod' below in chapter four.

⁵³ Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 196.

⁵⁴ Pervo, *Acts*, 302–303 and 303, n.20. Pervo's late date for Acts (ca. 115 CE) allows him to see all of the synoptic gospel traditions behind the King Herod of Acts 12 (Ibid., 5).

⁵⁵ Ibid., 123.

do. In two separate publications, Raymond E. Brown notes the difficulty that he believes early readers of the gospels would have had in differentiating between the Herods, not just in Luke-Acts, but in the synoptic narratives in general. In *The Birth of the Messiah* Brown writes, ‘One may well wonder whether early Christian hearers of the Gospel stories kept the various Herods distinct.’⁵⁶ Likewise, he states in *The Death of the Messiah*, ‘Three men in the NT are called Hērōdes: Herod the Great, Herod Antipas, and Herod Agrippa I.... How many hearers or readers would have known that these were three different men?’⁵⁷ Unfortunately, Brown does not address this matter further.⁵⁸ Though Brown’s statements evidence a reader-oriented approach, he does highlight from a historical perspective the problem in the gospels that this thesis seeks to address from a literary perspective in Luke-Acts, i.e., the repetition of the name ‘Herod’ for various individuals. F. Scott Spencer writes concerning the King Herod of Acts 12, ‘Literarily, however, this figure is closely fused with other Herod-titled rulers in Luke-Acts to form a composite Herodian profile’.⁵⁹ Spencer notes the similarities between Herod the Tetrarch in the third gospel and King Herod in Acts, to the point of agreeing with Darr’s overwhelmingly negative assessment of Antipas as ‘a varmint in the Lord’s field, a murderer of God’s agents, a would-be disrupter of the divine economy’,⁶⁰ but still makes a distinction between Herod the Tetrarch and Herod the King.⁶¹ Beverley Roberts Gaventa’s

⁵⁶ Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 2nd ed. (London: Chapman, 1993), 614.

⁵⁷ Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, vol. 1 (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 784.

⁵⁸ In chapter three below I will consider what Luke’s readers may have known about the Herods as a potential objection to my argument for ‘Herod’ as a composite character.

⁵⁹ F. Scott Spencer, *Journeying through Acts: A Literary-Cultural Reading* (Peabody: Hendricksen, 2004), 133.

⁶⁰ Cf. Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 144.

⁶¹ Spencer, *Journeying*, 133.

comment that the name ‘Herod’ ties Agrippa I and Antipas together and signifies that Agrippa is an enemy is similar to Spencer’s interpretation, but the distinction between the two rulers still remains for her.⁶² Closest to our understanding of ‘Herod’ as a composite is John Weaver’s analysis of Acts 12 in his monograph *Plots of Epiphany*. Weaver states that Luke uniquely uses the name ‘Herod’ for Agrippa I, predisposing the reader against Herod by recalling the antagonism of Herod in the third gospel, and is purposely ‘engaged in a conscious name-play’ in order to suit his ‘literary purposes and patterns’.⁶³ Weaver states that the repetition of the name ‘Herod’ at Acts 13:1 is a conflation that ‘encourages the reader to equate the two Herods’.⁶⁴ Weaver’s discussion approaches my argument and conclusion, acknowledging that Luke likely intended for his readers to conflate the Herods, though he pursues the matter no further.

Conclusion: Justification of the Current Project

The differences between the conclusions of scholars regarding the Herods in Luke-Acts in the works surveyed above and the current project is simply a matter of undertaking different tasks. As I have stated above, this thesis benefits greatly from scholarly works that focus on the historical Herods and the Herodian rulers in Luke-Acts. There are several key ideas running through the scholarly literature that support my thesis: Luke’s depiction of Antipas and Agrippa I in remarkably similar ways, the

⁶² Beverley Roberts Gaventa, *Acts*, ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003), 182–183.

⁶³ John B. Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles*, BZNTW 131 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 209–210.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 210, n. 167.

anomalous occurrence of the name ‘Herod’ for Agrippa I at Acts 12, and the chronological problems surrounding Luke 1-2. The contribution of this thesis will be to construe these pieces of evidence so as to demonstrate that ‘Herod’ is a composite character by underscoring the distinctive features of the depiction of the Herods in Luke-Acts (Luke 1:5; Acts 12), which in turn, allow an interpretation of ‘Herod’ as a single character. This raises the question regarding *how* the thesis will accomplish its aim. So, before I discuss composite ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts, I will outline the methodological parameters of the thesis.

Chapter 3: Methodological Considerations

The following explanation of the methodological parameters will discuss three concerns related to demonstrating that ‘Herod’ may be understood as a composite character. First, I will side with those scholars who, in narrative studies of Luke-Acts, approach the works as a unified narrative. Second, I will examine aspects of characterisation in light of ancient considerations and contemporary scholarly discussions of the matter. This examination will primarily look at *how* characterisation happens in a literary work with an emphasis on the consistency with which a character is portrayed and in a manner that ultimately drives the concerns of the plot of the work. These first two methodological considerations are important for the analysis of ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts in chapters five and six in which I will show that ‘Herod’ is consistently portrayed as an antagonist to Luke’s protagonists who works to hinder the spread of the gospel to the end of the earth, which is one of the key themes of the works. Third, I will consider composite characters in ancient writings. Here I will show that composites appear in ancient texts and that the means of determining the presence of a composite is by comparing what is known about the historical individuals *behind* the character with the character’s literary depiction. This is necessary because chapter four will present brief biographical sketches of the various Herodian rulers that comprise the composite ‘Herod’ of Luke-Acts. Doing so will highlight the two distinctive features of the depiction of the Herods in Luke-Acts (Luke 1:5 and Acts 12) that contribute to understanding ‘Herod’ as a composite.

Over the past several decades, narrative and literary-critical readings of the documents of the NT have become a standard approach to NT interpretation. Luke-Acts has not received as much narrative-critical attention as the second and fourth gospels,¹ likely due to scholars regarding the books primarily as a work (or works) of historiography or biography.² While many features of Luke-Acts lend the works to historiographical and biographical investigations, we should bear in mind that the author of the works labelled them a διήγησις, i.e., a narrative account (Luke 1:1).³

¹ Two influential volumes are David Rhoads and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982) and R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983). The lasting impact of these two volumes on NT narrative critical studies is apparent in the two multi-author volumes they have generated, Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore, eds., *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008) and Christopher W. Skinner and Kelly Iverson, eds., *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011). More general, introductory studies include Mark Allen Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990); James Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005); Stephen D. Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* (London: Yale University Press, 1992); Norman R. Petersen, *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978). Several important narratological works that have influenced biblical scholars include Mieke Bal, *Narratology: An Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, 3rd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009); Frank Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative* (London: Harvard University, 1979); Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (London: Cornell University, 1978). Important works in OT narrative criticism include Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981); Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, trans. Dorothea Shefer-Vanson, JSOTSS 70 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989); Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*, Bible and Literature (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983).

² See e.g., Joel B. Green and Michael McKeever, *Luke-Acts & New Testament Historiography*, IBR Bibliographies (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1995); Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, SupNovT 64 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1992); Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004); Richard A. Burridge, 'The Genre of Acts - Revisited,' in *Reading Acts Today: Essays in Honour of Loveday C. A. Alexander*, ed. Steve Walton et al., LNTS 427 (London: T & T Clark, 2011), 3–28.

³ BDAG, 245; LSJ, 427. Though this word is a NT *hapax*, Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 38 draws attention to Luke's own use of the cognate verb διηγέομαι in the sense of relating an account or narrative (cf. Luke 8:39; 9:10; Acts 8:33; 9:27; 12:17). Also, Joel B. Green, 'Internal Repetition in Luke-Acts: Contemporary Narratology and Lucan Historiography,' in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. by Ben Witherington III. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 286. Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel*, SNTSMS 78 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 111 prefers the meaning 'account' for διήγησις and notes that Luke's use of the term is 'exact, but not technical', and could be used to refer to relating the facts of a court case in story form, a historical narrative, or even a medical treatise.

That the work purports to be a narrative account justifies a narrative approach to Luke-Acts.

Pioneering the literary study of Luke-Acts, as in so many other areas of Lukan studies, was Henry Cadbury,⁴ though literary studies of Luke-Acts moved into the scholarly mainstream of the late twentieth century through the work of Charles Talbert⁵ and, more importantly, the two-volume narrative commentary by Robert Tannehill.⁶ Considering the style of the final written work as a whole, Talbert sought to detect ‘formal patterns, rhythms, architectonic designs, or architecture’ of the writings.⁷ This study was more exploratory than definitive, but discovery of structural patterns in Luke-Acts has clearly had an effect on the study of the Lukan *Doppelwerk*, and on characterisation in Luke-Acts in particular, with numerous studies comparing and contrasting characters having appeared since Talbert.⁸

⁴ Henry J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*, HTS VI (New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969).

⁵ Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, SBLMS 20 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974). This foundational work undergirds his narrative commentaries, Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1988); Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, Rev. ed., Reading the New Testament (Macon: Smyth & Helwys Publishers, 2005).

⁶ Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1990).

⁷ Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 7.

⁸ See Green, ‘Internal Repetition,’ 317 who adds that patterns of repetition and recurrence are well within the conventions of both Hebraic and Hellenistic writing. The most complete treatment is Andrew D. Clarke, *Parallel Lives: The Relation of Paul to the Apostles in the Lukan Perspective*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2001) which focuses on the literary parallels between Paul and the other apostles in Luke-Acts. Also see Augustin George, ‘Le parallèle entre Jean-Baptiste et Jésus en Luc 12,’ in *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Bédard Rigaux*, ed. Albert Descamps and R. P. Andre de Halleux (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), 147–171; A. J. Mattill, Jr., ‘The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H. H. Evans Reconsidered,’ *NovT* 17 (1975): 15–46; Susan Marie Praeder, ‘Jesus-Paul, Peter-Paul, and Jesus-Peter Parallelisms in Luke-Acts: A History of Reader Response,’ in *SBL Seminar Papers 1984* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984), 23–40; David P. Moessner, ‘The Christ Must Suffer: New Light on the Jesus - Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts,’ *NovT* 28 (1986): 220–256.

However, in many ways, Tannehill's own *Doppelwerk* set the tone for narrative-critical studies of Luke-Acts. In both volumes of his *Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, Tannehill emphasises and applies concepts that are now axiomatic for narrative-critical studies, e.g., proceeding from the assumption that Luke-Acts is the product of a single author that is meant to be read as a unified whole and noting the many internal thematic connections that characters and their actions echo throughout the narrative.⁹ Tannehill's approach to Luke-Acts as a unified story with discernible structural patterns, internal consistency, and the development of multiple themes in service of an overarching purpose forms the broad narrative-critical methodological parameters within which this project will work. To say this is to immediately raise questions concerning what is meant by the narrative unity of Luke-Acts.

First, with regard to the narrative unity of Luke-Acts, studies focusing on the reception history of Luke and Acts have shown that, based on available evidence, Christians in the first few centuries of the church did not read Luke and Acts together.¹⁰ However, even those who wish to separate the two books based on their reception in the early church do not sever completely the narrative links between them and allow for reading the two works as a literary whole.¹¹ While studies of

⁹ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: xiii, 3.

¹⁰ Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*, WUNT II 169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Andrew Gregory, 'The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts,' *JSNT* 29 (2007): 459–472; C. Kevin Rowe, 'Literary Unity and Reception History: Reading Luke-Acts as Luke and Acts,' *JSNT* 29 (2007): 449–457. The debate surrounding this issue has resulted in the multi-author volume, Andrew Gregory and C. Kevin Rowe, eds., *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010). We agree with Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982), 3 who states that there is no evidence that a 'single volume' named Luke-Acts ever existed.

¹¹ Andrew Gregory, 'The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts,' in *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, ed. Andrew Gregory and C. Kevin Rowe (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010), 82; C. Kevin Rowe, 'Literary Unity and Reception History,' in *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, ed. Andrew Gregory and C. Kevin Rowe (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010), 76; C. Kevin Rowe, 'History,

reception history can shed light on how readers in the earliest centuries of the church may have read and interpreted Luke and Acts, it does not demand that modern interpreters abandon the advances made by reading Luke and Acts together.

The most significant challenge to the unity of Luke-Acts is chapter three of *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* by Mikeal Parsons and Richard Pervo.¹² Parsons and Pervo appeal to a distinction made by Chatman in *Story and Discourse* between the *story* of a narrative (*what* a narrative contains, i.e., the portrayal of characters and action) and the *discourse* of a narrative (*how* the narrative tells the story, i.e., the syntactical means by which the story is told).¹³ Parsons and Pervo examine the unity of Luke-Acts at the discourse level, not the story level, noting several distinctions between Luke and Acts at the discourse level including: first person narration in Acts (the ‘we’ passages) but not in Luke, the protagonists’ style of speech in Acts is different than that of Jesus in Luke (though the Acts protagonists perform miracles that are similar to Jesus’), the use of certain particles (e.g., *τε* only appears by itself in Acts), the different functions of the scenes in each work that appear to parallel certain characters’ experiences with Jesus’, the presence of a distinct preface for Acts, etc.¹⁴ Parsons and Pervo have rightly problematized the *assumption* of the narrative unity of Luke and Acts. However, some observations may be made in response to their critique. For instance, they argue that the

Hermeneutics and the Unity of Luke-Acts,’ *JSNT* 28 (2005): 131. See also Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary (Introduction and 1:1-2:47)*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 552–553.

¹² Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

¹³ *Ibid.*, 46. Cf. Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 19.

¹⁴ Parsons and Pervo, *Rethinking*, 46–78.

characterisation of certain characters changes between the two works.¹⁵ This thesis will argue, on the contrary, that ‘Herod’ is depicted consistently in both works.¹⁶ Additionally, while Parsons and Pervo note that the preface of Acts serves a disjunctive function, it also serves a connective function, as they concede.¹⁷ Further, their observation that the protagonists of Acts speak about different matters than Jesus did in the third gospel may be overstated. The primary subject of Jesus’ teaching in Luke is the Kingdom of God.¹⁸ Though this theme is seemingly not as prevalent in Acts, it does serve as an *inclusio* for the whole work (Acts 1:3; 28:31). Also, Parsons and Pervo’s distinction between the preaching/teaching of Jesus in Luke and the protagonists’ preaching in Acts does not account for the fundamental shift in the content of proclamation in Acts that the resurrection and ascension of Jesus causes. It is no surprise that the content of the apostles’ preaching in Acts exhibits both continuity and discontinuity with that of Jesus; in the post-resurrection narrative the person and work of Jesus himself becomes the central aspect of the church’s proclamation.¹⁹ These responses show that even at the discourse level there is continuity between Luke and Acts that supports approaching the works as a narrative unity that exists not only in the mind of the modern reader (as Parsons and Pervo contend),²⁰ but also in the mind of the original author. Therefore, while

¹⁵ Ibid., 71–72. The example they cite is the relatively positive portrayal of the Jewish populace in Luke as compared to Acts.

¹⁶ We could cite other examples as well, e.g., the Jewish religious leaders, the Pharisees, anonymous centurions.

¹⁷ Parsons and Pervo, *Rethinking*, 59–60.

¹⁸ Graham Stanton, ‘Message and Miracles,’ in *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 57.

¹⁹ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, AB 31 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 342.

²⁰ Parsons and Pervo, *Rethinking*, 83.

Parsons and Pervo are correct to question the assumption of narrative unity on the basis of discourse analysis, they only conclude that their protestations must be considered, not that they are definitive.²¹

The objections raised by reception studies and Parsons and Pervo do not make a narrative study of Luke-Acts futile as scholars recognise that interpreting literary works as inherent unities is foundational to narrative study.²² Moore points out that the bases of narrative-critical study include the unity and autonomous integrity of a literary work.²³ Rhoads states straightforwardly that narrative unity is a heuristic device that allows interpreters to discern patterns on the surface of the final narrative.²⁴ Concerning a narrative approach to Luke-Acts and the narrative unity of Luke and Acts in particular, Spencer writes, ‘...our attention should be fixed not on footnotes or bibliography (of which there are none), but on the finely-crafted, densely-packed final narrative product’.²⁵ Luke and Acts do present something of an anomaly in this regard as we are not interpreting a *single* work as a unified whole (as with the gospels of Mark, Matthew, and John), but rather two related works. To advocate an interpretation of Acts in continuity with the third gospel we need turn no

²¹ Ibid.

²² Keener, *Acts 1:1-2:47*, 551.

²³ Moore, *Literary Criticism*, 7–8.

²⁴ David Rhoads, ‘Narrative Criticism: Practices and Prospects,’ in *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, ed. David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, JSNTSS 184 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 267.

²⁵ F. Scott Spencer, ‘The Narrative of Luke-Acts: Getting to Know the Savior God,’ in *Issues in Luke-Acts*, ed. Michael Pahl and Sean Adams (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012), 122. For other defences of the narrative unity of Luke-Acts see Luke T. Johnson, ‘Literary Criticism of Luke-Acts: Is Reception History Pertinent?,’ in *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, ed. Andrew Gregory and C. Kevin Rowe (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010), 66–69; Joel B. Green, ‘Luke-Acts, or Luke and Acts? A Reaffirmation of Narrative Unity,’ in *Reading Acts Today: Essays in Honour of Loveday C. A. Alexander*, ed. Steve Walton et al., LNTS 427 (London: T & T Clark, 2011), 101–119; Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), chapter three.

further than the first sentence of Acts where Luke refers to a *πρῶτον λόγον* to which he directs Theophilus' attention. In his *πρῶτον λόγον* the author *ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων...ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν* (Acts 1:1). The impression this comment creates is that what follows in the second book is a continuation of the story that the author narrated in the *πρῶτον λόγον*.²⁶ Though these observations do not conclusively end the debate concerning the narrative unity of Luke and Acts, it does demonstrate that Acts was meant to be read in light of the third gospel as a continuation of the story of Jesus. So, while we can rightly concede that the narrative unity of Luke-Acts is a heuristic construct that aids a particular type of interpretation, and that there are challenges rightly levelled against assuming unity too quickly, there are nevertheless indications in the texts themselves that Luke-Acts tells a continuous story. Therefore, I will proceed by reading the books as a unified, continuous narrative.²⁷

²⁶ Keener, *Acts 1:1-2:47*, 552; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 195; F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Third Revised and Enlarged Ed. (Leicester: Apollos, 1990), 98; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles I-XIV*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 66–67; Beverley Roberts Gaventa, *Acts*, ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003), 34, 62–63; Burridge, 'Genre of Acts,' 28.

²⁷ There is nothing revolutionary about this approach; it is standard among those who undertake a narrative analysis of Luke-Acts, e.g., Luke T. Johnson, *Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991); Luke T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, SP 5 (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992); Green, *Gospel of Luke*; Green, 'Internal Repetition'; F. Scott Spencer, *Journeying Through Acts: A Literary-Cultural Reading* (Peabody: Hendricksen, 2004); William S. Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993). Others apply this methodology to smaller sections of the Lukan narrative as they relate the parts of the narrative to the larger whole, e.g., Donald Miesner, 'The Missionary Journeys Narrative: Patterns and Implications,' in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978), 199–214; O. Wesley Allen, Jr., *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS 158 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997); Robert J. Karris, *Luke, Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account as Literature*, Theological Inquiries (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1985). Furthermore, if the argument that 'Herod' is a composite character is persuasive, it will provide an additional reason for approaching Luke and Acts as a literary unity. This study will utilise the NA²⁸, the standard critical text for NT studies.

As this thesis examines one aspect of narrative, characterisation, it is necessary to discuss a method for discerning how characters (particularly characters in Hellenistic writings) are depicted. In this regard, we immediately concede that in literature of the Hellenistic period there was no thoroughgoing method or theory of characterisation.²⁸ Instead, scholars agree that plot was the central concern of Hellenistic authors with characters depicted in ways that aid in developing that plot.²⁹ Therefore, characters often appear in stereotyped roles assigned to them by the author that they fill (relatively) consistently throughout a work.³⁰ This reality does not make the study of characters in ancient texts a vain exercise. There are still characters; we simply need to discern how characters are portrayed to serve plot concerns and allow those concerns to drive how we conceive of characters.³¹ The ancient subordination of character to plot also does not mean that the analyses put forth by modern theorists regarding characters are worthless. Rather, *how* a narrative reveals a character is remarkably similar in literature of all ages. Therefore, as I

²⁸ Outi Lehtipuu, 'Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and the Poor Man in Luke 16.19-31,' in *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, ed. David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, JSNTSS 184 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 75 states, 'We do not know very well how ancients viewed people or how characters in literature reflected that view'.

²⁹ Moore, *Literary Criticism*, 15.

³⁰ See Robert Scholes, James Phelan, and Robert Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative*, Fortieth Anniversary Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 161–165. John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*, JSNTSS 163 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 89 points out that this was true of characters in literature through the medieval period. Also see David B. Gowler, 'Characterization in Luke: A Socio-Narratological Approach,' *BTB* 19 (1989): 58; John A. Darr, *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 48; Lehtipuu, 'Characterization and Persuasion,' 75. See also the essay on various characters in the Gospel of John, Raymond Collins, 'The Representative Figures of the Fourth Gospel,' in *These Things Have Been Written: Studies on the Fourth Gospel*, LTPM 2 (Louvain: Peeters Press, 1990), 1–45.

³¹ My final chapter will demonstrate this principle. After the discussion of Luke's characterisation of composite 'Herod', I will discuss how 'Herod' serves to embody Satanic opposition toward Luke's protagonists and the proclamation of the good news of the Kingdom of God.

outline the methodological approach I utilise in this thesis, I will: 1) briefly discuss the observations of Aristotle in *The Poetics* that he makes regarding characters and 2) utilise Aristotle's comments on characters as a sort of paradigm for characterisation in Hellenistic literature and supplement this by drawing on modern theorists in order to further explain how characterisation takes place.

Aristotle's *Poetics* reveals the relation of plot and character(s) noted above, with plot as the primary element of the various types of literature that are representative of life and character(s) as a secondary element that present the actions and choices necessary to unravel the plot.³² Specifically, at 15.1-6, Aristotle outlines four features of character (ἦθος) that an author should attempt to attain: 1) χρηστός (goodness),³³ 2) ἀρμόζω (fitness),³⁴ 3) ὅμοιος (similarity to the historic personage represented),³⁵ and 4) ὁμαλός (consistency).³⁶

³² E.g., epic poetry, tragic drama, comedy, flute with harp playing (1.2). On plot and character see Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1.2; 6.12–15, 19; 7.3–4; 9.1–3; 15.1–12. By noting Aristotle's thoughts on characters I am not proposing that the author of Luke-Acts was directly dependent on *The Poetics* in the formulation of his characters, only that Aristotle notes the conventions of characters in Hellenistic writing and his influence was likely to have extended over some time.

³³ Goodness is revealed in the character's words and choices. This does not mean that characters cannot be bad or evil, but the author must not make characters unnecessarily bad (15.7-8) except in comedies (2.1-7).

³⁴ E.g., a female character should not act in a manly way.

³⁵ This feature does not undermine the study of composite characters since composites exhibit the similarity to several historic personages.

³⁶ This does not mean that a character cannot develop, only that the development must take place in accordance with the probability and inevitability of the plot (*Poetics* 15.10). Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 101–103 has warned against using the modern designations 'flat' and 'round' as proposed by E. M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (London: Harcourt, Inc., 1955), 67–78, preferring instead to view characters as static. 'Static' does not mean that characters do not change, only that, like Aristotle proposes, their change (if any) is consistent with the overall thrust of the plot. In this regard, Culpepper notes the examples of the Samaritan woman and blind man in John's gospel. The changes these characters undergo are examples of coming to faith in Jesus after realising his true nature, which is exactly what the author of the fourth gospel hoped for his readers (John 20:30-31). Culpepper rightly notes that even Jesus, who is undoubtedly the main character in all four gospels, is a static character. See also Thomas Docherty, *Reading (Absent) Character: Towards a Theory of Characterization in Fiction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 48 who states that if a character does not change, then s/he is a dead character. Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 110, writing from a modern literary-critical perspective, states that Aristotle's dimensions of character are not appropriate for a

Following Aristotle's parameters for the depiction of characters in various genres of Hellenistic literature, we may now turn to scholarly discussions of characterisation for more specific insights regarding how authors shape characters. I want to note five aspects of characterisation here.³⁷ First, the actions and words of a character are the most important feature in characterisation.³⁸ Though limited in number, 'Herod's' actions over against the chief protagonists of Luke-Acts will reveal his consistently antagonistic nature.³⁹ Unfortunately, in Luke-Acts, 'Herod' only speaks once (Luke 9:9), but as we will see, his words are entirely congruent with his actions.⁴⁰ Second, and related to the first, are statements made by protagonists about other characters, which reveal the true nature of the character to

general theory of narrative. While this is true, when dealing with literature of the Greco-Roman period and its meaning in that world, it is necessary to give preference to ancient conceptions of character (and narrative). If we choose to offer a modern reader-response interpretation, then Aristotle's categories will not suffice. However, that is not the objective of this thesis. Culpepper (101) points out that Aristotle's categories should not be used to judge whether characterisation is satisfactory or not, and this is true. However, I disagree with his statement that these features 'offer little assistance in the task of understanding how characters are shaped and how they function'. While Aristotle's features may not be as specific as a modern theorist would like, they nevertheless provide the parameters within which an author in the Hellenistic period should construct characters (as far as Aristotle is concerned). In this respect, it is likely that the author of Luke-Acts was working within these general parameters.

³⁷ Gowler, 'Characterization in Luke,' 55–57 utilises the same categories that I do here, but has classified them differently claiming that direct characterisation happens when a 'reliable' voice (that of the narrator, Jesus, or God) speaks about a character and all other forms of characterisation as indirect (direct speech, actions, appearance, settings, etc.). Of course, the voices of the narrator, Jesus, and God are reliable voices, but they are also characters in the texts themselves and must be accounted for as such.

³⁸ Christopher Pelling, 'Conclusion,' in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Christopher Pelling (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 248; Stephen Halliwell, 'Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character,' in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Christopher Pelling (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 52; Christopher Gill, 'The Character-Personality Distinction,' in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Christopher Pelling (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 2; Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?*, 199; Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 109–110; M. H. Abrams, 'Character and Characterization,' *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1988), 43. Scholes, Phelan, and Kellogg, *Nature of Narrative*, 181 give the example of Homer who prioritised deeds over thoughts.

³⁹ Darr, *On Character Building*, 41.

⁴⁰ Halliwell, 'Conceptions of Character,' 58 points out that direct speech is uncommon in Greek characterisation, which is more descriptive, distant, and moralistic.

whom the speaking character refers.⁴¹ So, the statements about ‘Herod’ that Luke attributes to characters such as Jesus (Luke 13:31-33), the Jerusalem church (Acts 4:27), Peter (Acts 12:11), and a crowd of people in Caesarea (Acts 12:22) will confirm ‘Herod’s’ evil and antagonistic nature. Additionally, Luke contributes his own ‘voice’ at several junctions with regard to ‘Herod’ (Luke 3:19-20; 9:7-8; 23:8-12; Acts 12:1-6, 20-21, 23) adding further confirmation of ‘Herod’s’ character.

Third, how characters illustrate the various themes of a work, through the repetition of key vocabulary and concepts with reference to the character, helps determine the portrayal of the character.⁴² For instance, Darr has noted that Luke describes a proper response to Jesus in terms of seeing and hearing Jesus and discerning his true significance, a response that Herod Antipas fails to make.⁴³ In other words, ‘Herod’s’ desire to see Jesus (Luke 9:9) coupled with his actually seeing Jesus and failing to hear (Luke 23:8-11) is one motif among many that the author uses to interpret responses to Jesus. Fourth, when characters are associated with one another, the portrayal of each is mutually informing. For ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts, this is particularly evident as this character regularly appears alongside other antagonistic characters, particularly Pontius Pilate and the Jewish religious leaders (Luke 3:1-2; 13:31; Acts 4:1-31; 12:1-5). Fifth, the settings in which characters appear contribute

⁴¹ Gowler, ‘Characterization in Luke,’ 56; Pelling, ‘Conclusion,’ 248–249.

⁴² Pelling, ‘Conclusion,’ 261.

⁴³ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 68, 212; Pelling, ‘Conclusion,’ 251 states that the character’s pattern of behaviour forms the background for the choice(s) he/she makes. Halliwell, ‘Conceptions of Character,’ 50 states that it is ‘difficult to overestimate the Greek tendency to evaluate character in overtly ethical terms...’. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 145 draws attention to this reality for characters in the gospel of John. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?*, 199 notes that this is true of characters in all four canonical gospels.

to their overall depiction in a story.⁴⁴ ‘Herod’ appears in the key geographic locales of Jesus’ ministry – Jerusalem and Judaea (Luke 1:5; 23:6-12; Acts 4:27), Galilee (Luke 3:1; 9:7-9), and the travel narrative (Luke 13:31) – as well as in Jerusalem and Caesarea as the mission of the early church is beginning to spread out beyond Jerusalem and Judaea (Acts 12; 23:35). The narrative depiction of the settings adds to the portrayal of the characters and *vice versa*. All of these features will be explored fully with regard to ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts.⁴⁵

With these general considerations in place we now turn to a specific feature of characterisation that has direct bearing on this thesis: the role of a character’s proper name, ‘Herod’ in this case. Resseguie points out, ‘Proper names are saturated with meaning’.⁴⁶ Dawsey, in his article on how readers ‘build’ a character through the reading process and conceive of individuality through that process states, ‘The proper name, especially in “classical” texts like the Gospels, becomes the crucial factor in the construction of character...’.⁴⁷ Names are typically the primary way authors identify characters and characterise them.⁴⁸ In arguing that ‘Herod’ is a

⁴⁴ Darr, *On Character Building*, 39–40; Moore, *Literary Criticism*, 42; Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism*, 94.

⁴⁵ Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism*, 121–122.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 128.

⁴⁷ James M. Dawsey, ‘What’s in a Name? Characterization in Luke,’ *BTB* 16 (1986): 17.

⁴⁸ Docherty, *Reading*, 45 points out that the proper name is the first identifiable attribute of character in the realist tradition. Forster, *Aspects*, 68 states, the recurrence of a proper name is the key visual clue for the reader in assessing characters and comes before the emotional investment a reader makes as s/he repeatedly encounters a character in a story. As Matthew V. Novenson, *Christ Among the Messiahs: Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 68–72 argues with regard to the name/title debate concerning the term *χριστός*, names function both to denote and connote. See also Anna Morpurgo Davies, ‘Greek Personal Names and Linguistic Continuity,’ in *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*, ed. Elaine Matthews and Simon Hornblower, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 104 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 20 who argues that names primarily denote, but also serve a classificatory function. The concerns of both Novenson and Davies are historical. In the narrative critical approach taken here, I would agree that a name both denotes and connotes, but that the connotations are limited to what the author writes about the particular character being denoted by the name. I will discuss in a

composite character, I will follow Docherty, who states that the first appearance of a name in a narrative work is a *blanc sémantique* around which the traits of that character are gathered,⁴⁹ an approach that Docherty labels ‘essentialist nomination’, i.e., the name sums up the character.⁵⁰ I add to this Chatman’s argument that a character is a ‘paradigm of traits’ that unfolds or emerges earlier or later in the story.⁵¹ The character’s proper name is the focalising point for this ‘paradigm of traits’, the ‘quintessence of selfhood’ and ‘locus of qualities’ giving the illusion of being the sum total of the traits.⁵² As we will see below, this is precisely what occurs with the name ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts with the paradigm of traits that may be summed up as the ruler’s rejection of the gospel proclamation and hostility toward Luke’s central protagonists gathered around that name. Since in my proposal ‘Herod’ is a composite character that is comprised of three distinct Herodian rulers, we must consider the possibility of amalgamating different historic individuals into a single character.

note how the repetition of the name ‘Herod’ is different from other proper names that are repeated in Luke-Acts in the next chapter.

⁴⁹ Docherty, *Reading*, 47. Simon Goldhill, ‘Character and Action, Representation and Reading: Greek Tragedy and Its Critics,’ in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, ed. Christopher Pelling (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 108–109 references Docherty, adding that the repetition of a name within a literary tradition is a crucial dimension of Greek drama and that characterisation continues across various texts. Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 140–141, in his comments on Luke 3:1–2, notes the recurrence of the name ‘Herod’ (cf. Luke 1:5) but argues that the titles ‘King’ and ‘Tetrarch’ serve to distinguish the two Herods. I will address this matter in the next chapter and argue that the two titles may refer to the same character.

⁵⁰ Docherty, *Reading*, 48–49, 54.

⁵¹ Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 126.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 130–131, 139–140. Chatman does go on to state (rather obviously) that this does not apply to unnamed characters.

Composite Characters Considered

The idea of a composite character comprised of several historic individuals is rarely, if ever, considered. Typically, what may be understood as a composite character is interpreted as a historical error or ignorance on the part of an ancient author.⁵³ Sack offers a potential corrective to that accusation levelled against ancient authors concerning the historicity of their texts and depictions of characters stating that the author likely had an accurate knowledge of history but chose to present the character as he did so as to fulfil his didactic purposes. Sack concludes, ‘If the end result appeared to a historian or a literary critic as confusion, it was simply the product of a misunderstanding of what the author intended to do’.⁵⁴ While scholars may occasionally posit that composite characters appear in literature to serve an author’s rhetorical, ideological, and political purposes,⁵⁵ without direct access to the mind of the author, it is impossible to know whether the author was mistaken, confused, or purposely conflating characters. Doubtless, some composite characters appear as the result of confusion in the mind of an author or reader utilising a source (as in the case of the *Letter of Herod to Pilate* referenced in the introduction); others may be more deliberate. Again, my argument is less about recovering Luke’s intentions and more about analysing the distinctive features of the depiction of the

⁵³ E.g., see Craig Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Study: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody: Hendricksen, 2005), 13 who states that the Book of Judith contains several such historical blunders and anachronisms. Or, see Johnson, *Luke*, 49 who concludes his comments on the census of Quirinius in Luke 2:1-2 that Luke simply had his facts wrong.

⁵⁴ Ronald Sack, *Images of Nebuchadnezzar: The Emergence of a Legend*, 2nd rev. and exp. ed. (London: Associated University Presses, 2004), 104.

⁵⁵ Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 90. Ann Graham Brock, *Mary Magdalene, The First Apostle: The Struggle for Authority*, HTS 51 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 123 demonstrates that an author’s politics are on display when authors replace characters in the stories drawn from their source material with different characters in their versions of the stories. She cites several examples where Mary Magdalene is replaced by others (e.g., Mary of Nazareth, Peter) in later texts.

Herods in the narrative of Luke-Acts and explaining those features as a composite character. In what follows, I will simply show that composite characters appear in ancient texts and that this feature is not unique to 'Herod' in Luke-Acts. Though the discussion of each example is necessarily brief, these examples demonstrate that we may conclude that a composite character appears in a text by comparing and contrasting what is known historically about the person/people *behind* the character with a particular textual portrayal of that character in the same way that I will do with Luke's 'Herod'.

Before proceeding, it is necessary to remind ourselves of the definition of a composite character presented in the introduction: a composite character is an amalgamation of multiple historic people that appears as a single character in a literary work. Examples of composite characters in literature (roughly) contemporaneous with Luke-Acts corroborate my understanding of 'Herod'. Though composite characters are not common in literature of any period in history, the convention does seem to have been utilised occasionally in Hebrew, Hellenistic, early Jewish, and early Christian literature of various genres.

Beginning with Hebrew literature, Burns has argued that the character 'Pharaoh' in several literary works of the Hebrew Scriptures is a figure who has transcended history to become the arch-enemy of God and the people of God.⁵⁶ Burns argues that beyond the name/title 'Pharaoh',

⁵⁶ John Barclay Burns, 'Pharaoh in the Old Testament: A Literary Degradation,' *Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 7 (1987): 17–26.

...further identification was unnecessary or impossible. Pharaoh plays, for the most part, a theological rather than an historical role. Thus, he must be considered from perspectives other than purely historical.⁵⁷

In this way, authors of various texts in the Hebrew Bible draw on the Exodus traditions that pervade their history and sacred texts in order to evoke the memory of oppression in Egypt and God's deliverance from the 'enemy *par excellence*' by showing YHWH's superiority to 'Pharaoh': the ruler is fooled by Abraham and punished for bringing Sarah into his harem, he is 'passive and pliable' in relation to Joseph, a tool of God's will in the case of the Exodus, and a cedar that is felled by its hubris in the prophecies of Ezek 31-32.⁵⁸ Historical inquiry could identify the Pharaoh or Pharaohs who stand behind these stories. However, in the case of the Hebrew Bible's 'Pharaoh', we see a title/name of a historic individual (or individuals) utilised by Jewish authors to refer to no particular ruler, but rather to create a character that embodies oppression and slavery in their writings.

In the LXX, we may note the character Nebuchadnezzar, King of Assyria in the Book of Judith. Though such a ruler never existed, Otzen argues that the author of that work has likely taken two enemies of God's people – one a ruler, one an empire – and combined them to create a 'supra-historical enemy of God'.⁵⁹ 'Nebuchadnezzar' appears as such a supra-historical literary figure in other ancient

⁵⁷ Ibid., 17. The exceptions are Jeremiah's Pharaoh Necho (Jer 44:30) and Pharaoh Apries Hophra (Jer 46:2).

⁵⁸ Ibid., 18–24.

⁵⁹ Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, 90–91. R. H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament: In English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*, vol. 1: Apocrypha (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 246 states, 'Nebuchadnezzar is introduced as the typical arch-enemy of Judaea'; the details are not meant to be historical. Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom, *The Roman Empire in Luke's Narrative*, LNTS 404 (London: T & T Clark, 2010), 35, 39 notes the role that both Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar play as stereotypical enemy and conqueror respectively in the Hebrew Scriptures.

texts as well. Sack has argued that Hellenistic Jewish authors, including the authors of the Book of Daniel, certain Apocryphal works, and the *Midrash Rabbah* have conflated Nebuchadnezzar II with Nabonidus in order ‘to construct an image of a king that could be [sic] easily related to the rule of any monarch at any point in time’.⁶⁰ This king besieges Jerusalem, destroys the Temple, and/or deports the people of Judaea.⁶¹ As an example, Sack cites the character ‘Nebuchadnezzar’ of Dan 3-4. Sack contends that in Dan 3:1-3 the Jewish author brought not only the Jewish hatred of Nebuchadnezzar to his depiction of the king, but also the Persian contempt for Nabonidus resulting in a character that appears as a ‘conqueror-king who forsook his god and required worship of another by his subjects’.⁶² Carrying this disdain for both rulers over to Dan 4, Sack argues that the madness of Nebuchadnezzar evidences influence of the *Prayer of Nabonidus* (especially in the king’s absence from the city in both texts) and that the author has created a single character out of both traditions.⁶³ Perhaps Otzin and Sack go too far in claiming that the authors of these texts have conflated various enemies of God’s people, but the point of my discussion of composite characters still remains: that if we compare and contrast what is known about historical individuals with their depiction in certain texts we may safely conclude that the character is a composite.

Reardon offers another Greek example, in this instance from a non-Jewish source. In the introduction to his translation of *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Reardon

⁶⁰ Sack, *Images of Nebuchadnezzar*, 107.

⁶¹ Ibid., 103–108; 161, n. 35.

⁶² Ibid., 105.

⁶³ Ibid., 106–107.

points out that Chariton's Artaxerxes is a composite character with both Artaxerxes II and III standing behind the single literary character.⁶⁴ Reardon states that Chariton's King Artaxerxes is intended to represent Artaxerxes II Mnemon

whose wife, like Chariton's Persian queen, was called Statira; he may also recall Artaxerxes III Ochus, for he too successfully withstood a revolt by Egypt, as does Chariton's king.⁶⁵

Chariton's Artaxerxes therefore provides an example of a Greek writing contemporaneous with Luke-Acts in which a composite character appears.

Moving to the period after the completion of the NT, scholars utilising Rabbinic literature as a source for historical inquiry have noted the conflation of various individuals into composite characters. For example, Bickerman notes that the rabbis sometimes collapsed the entire Seleucid dynasties into a single 'Antiochus' and that Byzantine writers conflated King Ptolemy and Ptolemy the astronomer into a single person.⁶⁶ As another example, Albert Baumgarten cites the debate between Abbaye and Rava over whether Yohanan and Yannai were the same person or different persons (b. *Ber.* 29a).⁶⁷ Furthermore, Daniel Schwartz shows that rabbinic traditions regarding 'King Agrippa' specify neither father nor son, thus creating a 'stock image' of Agrippa that could refer either to the father or son and that this

⁶⁴ Reardon notes that this is one of several historical anachronisms in the novel (e.g., he cites the presence of Hermocrates, a fifth century Syracusan statesman, in a story that covers events that occurred in the fourth century). Another composite character in *Callirhoe* may be Dionysius, whose name was shared by two tyrants in Syracuse in the fourth century. Chariton, 'Chaereas and Callirhoe,' in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, trans. and ed. B. P. Reardon (London: University of California Press, 1989), 18.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ E. J. Bickerman, 'The Chain of Pharisaic Tradition,' in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, ed. Amram Tropper (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 528–529.

⁶⁷ Albert I. Baumgarten, 'Rabbinic Literature as a Source for the History of Jewish Sectarianism in the Second Temple Period,' *DSD* 2 (1995): 30.

image is carried over in some cases from the first to the second king.⁶⁸ Seth Schwartz adds that the ambiguous ‘King Agrippa’ has been placed in the tradition because ‘of his reputation as the greatest Jewish grandee’.⁶⁹ To summarise this brief point about King Agrippa, I cite Daniel Schwartz once again, who states the case well, ‘...as frequently happens in religious traditions about the past, more than one character, especially when they both bear the same name, have been amalgamated into one’.⁷⁰ While the concerns of these rabbinic scholars are historical, I cite them here illustratively to provide additional evidence that ancient individuals, even from the recent pasts relative to the dating of the documents in which they appear, sometimes appear as composite characters in various writings.⁷¹

Remaining in the post-NT period, examples of composite characters appear in early Christian traditions about various individuals. For instance, Shoemaker argues that the ‘Mary’ of the *Gospel of Philip* is a composite, fulfilling the roles of Jesus’ mother, sister, and companion.⁷² Similarly, Good has shown that ‘Mary’ in *Pistis*

⁶⁸ Daniel Schwartz, *Agrippa I: The Last King of Judaea*, TSAJ 23 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990), 158–170. The Rabbinic passages that refer to King Agrippa are m.*Bikk.* 3.4; t.*Bikk.* 2.10; m.*Sot.* 7.8; t.*Sot.* 7.16–17; b.*Sot.* 41b; y.*Sot.* 7.7; b.*Pes.* 107b. Also see Solomon Zeitlin, ‘Herod: A Malevolent Maniac,’ *JQR* 54 (1963): 7–8.

⁶⁹ Seth Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaeen Politics*, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition XVII (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 162.

⁷⁰ Schwartz, *Agrippa I*, 162. S. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaeen Politics*, 161–169 follows D. Schwartz in this.

⁷¹ Writing about the difficulty that scholars have had in identifying the ‘Antoninus’ whose conversations with Rabbi Yehuda are recorded in the Babylonian Talmud, Samuel Krauss, *Antoninus und Rabbi*, Jahresbericht der Israelitisch-Theologischen XVII (Wien: Verlag der Israel-Theol. Lehranstalt, 1910), 70–87 offers eight proposed solutions. Here again we likely have a conflation of two or more Roman Emperors that the Talmudic authors hoped to portray in a positive light.

⁷² Stephen J. Shoemaker, ‘A Case of Mistaken Identity? Naming the Gnostic Mary,’ in *Which Mary?*, ed. by F. Stanley Jones, Symposium Series 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 7–8. In the same volume, Antti Marjanen, ‘The Mother of Jesus or the Magdalene? The Identity of Mary in the So-Called Gnostic Christian Texts,’ in *Which Mary?*, ed. by F. Stanley Jones, Symposium Series 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 31–42 debates Shoemaker on this point. Jane Schaberg, *The Resurrection of Mary Magdalene: Legends, Apocrypha, and the Christian Testament* (London: Continuum, 2002), 119 also contends that no conflation of Marys occurs in the Gnostic texts.

Sophia is a composite, evidencing features of Mary of Bethany and other women in the gospels.⁷³ Schaberg, describing the well-known transformation of Mary Magdalene from disciple of Jesus and witness to the resurrection into the penitent prostitute of later Christian tradition, notes that this transformation occurred because of the conflation of several women named ‘Mary’ and at least one anonymous character (the sinful woman of Luke 7:36-50) from the gospel narratives, a trend that continues into the present.⁷⁴ An additional Gnostic example is the ‘Philip’ of the *Acts of Philip*, who is a composite character with traits drawn from Philip the apostle of the canonical gospels and Philip the evangelist of the Book of Acts.⁷⁵ All of these examples show that composite characters feature in literature of various genres and spanning the periods before and after the composition of Luke-Acts. In addition to these examples, which show that composite characters are the creations of authors (though we could debate the intentions of the authors in several cases), we may also cite a few examples of readers conflating characters in their interpretations of texts.

⁷³ Dierdre Good, ‘Pistis Sophia,’ in *Searching the Scriptures*, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, vol. 2 (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1994), 703–704. Shoemaker, ‘Mistaken Identity,’ 8 agrees that this Mary is a composite, but is comprised of Mary of Nazareth and Mary of Magdala. Perhaps both authors are correct.

⁷⁴ Schaberg, *Resurrection of Mary Magdalene*, 65–120. See also Susan Haskins, *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor* (London: Harper Collins, 1993), 16–19, 93–97.

⁷⁵ Bertrand Bouvier, François Bovon, and Frédéric Amsler, trans., ‘ACTES DE PHILIPPE,’ in *Écrits Apocryphes Chrétiens* (Paris: Gallimard, 1997), 1182. Bovon’s introduction notes that viewing the two Philips as a single person was relatively common in the second century. George Salmon, *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*, 4th ed. (London: John Murray, 1889), 340 states that this conflation is due to the reverence of Philip the evangelist as a member of the apostolic company.

Readers Conflating Characters

While the present investigation is specifically text-oriented, it is helpful to note that, at times, readers who refer to Luke-Acts in their own writings sometimes conflated disparate characters who appeared in Luke's narrative with the same name. In this regard we can draw attention to Eusebius' citation of Polycrates and Papias, both of whom apparently believed that Philip the apostle and Philip the evangelist were the same person.⁷⁶ Schaberg has noted the occasional reading of Mary Magdalene (Luke 8:2) and Mary of Bethany (Luke 10:39) as a composite character.⁷⁷ As another example of potential conflation caused by the recurrence of a proper name in Luke-Acts we may consider 'Simeon' at Acts 15:14. Chrysostom, in his homily on Acts 15:13-15, believes that James' reference to Simeon does not mean Peter (cf. Acts 15:7-11), but rather Simeon the prophet of Luke 2:25-35.⁷⁸ Smothers, in an article addressing the text-critical issues in Chrysostom's homilies at this point, lays out the options other than Simon Peter regarding the identity of Simeon at Acts 15:14, which include the Simeon of Luke 2:25-35 and the Simeon (Niger) of Acts

⁷⁶ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.31.2-4 (citing Polycrates) and 3.39.9 (citing Papias) states that both Polycrates and Papias believed that these two, the apostle and the evangelist, were a single person. Polycrates and Papias conflated the two by stating that Philip the apostle had daughters (cf. Acts 21:8-9). Eusebius corrects these two writers at 3.31.5. Picking up this conflating tendency among second century authors, Christopher R. Matthews, *Philip: Apostle and Evangelist*, SupNovT 105 (Leiden: Brill, 2002) argues that only one historical Philip stands behind all of the traditions surrounding the name 'Philip' in early Christian documents, including Luke-Acts. F. Scott Spencer, *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study in Roles and Relations*, JSNTSS 67 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 34 argues that Philip the evangelist's emergence in the narrative of Acts 6:1-7 serves to set the two apart as Philip the apostle has already been identified earlier in the narrative (Acts 1:13) and it is the apostles who assign the community the task of finding men to lead in the distribution of food to the Hellenistic widows (Acts 6:2-3).

⁷⁷ Schaberg, *Resurrection of Mary Magdalene*, 75, though she explains this no further. See also Haskins, *Mary Magdalen*, 196-200, who describes this trend in later Christian textual and artistic traditions.

⁷⁸ St. John Chrysostom, *Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles and The Epistle to the Romans*, ed. Philip Schaff, NPNF XI (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1984), 384-385.

13:1-3.⁷⁹ Smothers concludes that Chrysostom misunderstood Acts 15:14 and sees no way to identify this person with anyone other than Simon Peter.⁸⁰ Stephen Fowl, discussing Chrysostom's (mis)identification of Simeon in Acts 15 in an unpublished paper that takes its starting point from Rainer Riesner's historical investigation into the question,⁸¹ argues that the reference to Simeon at Acts 15:14 is polyvalent, i.e., it refers both to Peter's report (Acts 15:7-11) *and* to Simeon's prophecy (Luke 2:29-32).⁸²

More pertinent to this thesis, some early readers and interpreters of the canonical gospels and Acts conflated the Herods. In particular, I draw attention to the second century *Gospel of Peter*. It is clear that this apocryphal gospel draws especially the gospels of Matthew and Luke in its construction of the Herod character who appears in its first two chapters. Interestingly, 'Herod' in *GPet* 1.2 is a 'King'. All three synoptics and Acts refer to some 'Herod' as 'King' (Mark 6:14, 22, 25-27; Matt 2:2; 14:9; Luke 1:5; Acts 4:27; 12:1), though a Herod in the passion narrative must historically be Herod Antipas, the Tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea. While *GPet*

⁷⁹ Edgar R. Smothers, 'Chrysostom and Symeon (Acts XV, 14),' *HTR* 46 (1953): 203-215.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 215.

⁸¹ Rainer Riesner, 'James's Speech (Acts 15:13-21), Simeon's Hymn (Luke 2:29-32), and Luke's Sources,' in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1994), 263-279.

⁸² Stephen Fowl, 'Simeon in Acts 15:14: The Voice of Simon Peter and Echoes of Simeon's Past,' n.d. I wish to thank Dr. Fowl both for pointing out this issue to me and for sharing his paper. We might also consider 'typed' or 'stock' characters in Luke-Acts that have been adopted from early Christian tradition such as Pharisees, Chief Priests, scribes, among others as kinds of composites. See M. H. Abrams, 'Stock Characters,' *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1988), 343-344, who states that these are characters that recur in particular genres that have become conventional for that form. Their success as characters is not simply that an author has incorporated them, but how well the author created a convincing character. In this same vein is Luke's possible conflation of an office or title when he writes of Annas and Caiaphas sharing the high priesthood in Luke 3:1-2.

is not as dependent upon Luke as it is Matthew in most respects,⁸³ as Paul Foster states, any inclusion of Herod in a passion narrative is evidence of dependence on the Gospel of Luke.⁸⁴ In addition to the presence of ‘Herod’ in a story of Jesus’ death, a second element of *GPet*’s portrayal of ‘Herod’ drawn from Luke-Acts is the close association of ‘Herod’ and Pilate (*GPet* 2.4-5; cf. Luke 3:1-2; 23:15; Acts 4:27).⁸⁵ If the ‘Herod’ of Luke-Acts can be shown to be a composite, then perhaps this character may have been part of the inspiration for the ‘Herod’ of the *GPet*. In any event, the ‘Herod’ of the *GPet* is a composite, drawn from the three synoptic gospels and Acts.⁸⁶

One other ancient author deserves mention here. In *Contra Celsum*, Origen cites Celsus who claims that Herod the Tetrarch ordered the slaughter of infants

⁸³ Two of Pilate’s actions in the canonical gospels are applied to Herod in this text: the hand washing (1.1; cf. Matt 27:24) and the command to take Jesus’ body off the cross (1.2; 2.4; cf. Matt 27:58; Mark 15:45).

⁸⁴ Paul Foster, *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary*, TENTS 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 145, 220–221.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 225, 242.

⁸⁶ Other apocryphal documents from the second through the sixth centuries also draw on Herod traditions from the synoptic gospels and Acts to create their own Herods. The *Protoevangelium of James* primarily relies on Matthew’s birth narrative, with 21.1–22.2 directly dependent upon Matt 2:1-8. *ProtoJam* 23.1-9 contains a narrative of Herod seeking to kill the infant John the Baptist, which is unattested in the canonical gospels, but likely draws on the stories of Herod Antipas’ execution of John in the synoptics (Matt 14:1-12; Mark 6:14-29; Luke 3:19-20; 9:9). If this is the case (which needs to be proven), then we would have another second century Christian document conflating Herod traditions. See Ronald F. Hock, *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas*, The Scholars Bible (Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 1995), 4–5; Richard I. Pervo, *Acts*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 303, n. 20. The so-called *Gospel of Gamaliel* also contains a composite ‘Herod’. See the translation in Forbes Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*, vol. 2, Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 4 (London: Cambridge University Press, 1896), 162–185. This text combines several elements from Luke: Jesus’ birth during the reign of Augustus (Luke 2:1-2) with Herod as Tetrarch of Judaea, a likely conflation of Luke 1:5 and 3:1 (and comparable to *Judith*’s Nebuchadnezzar, King of Assyria). The text also attempts to give a background to Herod and Pilate’s enmity (cf. Luke 23:12) by stating that Pilate wrote to Tiberius Caesar that Jesus was worthy to become the king of Judaea, resulting in Herod’s animosity toward Pilate. This may be a further conflation of the Herods of Luke 1:5 and 23:6-12. For an introductory discussion of these fragments, see Wilhelm Schneemelcher and R. McL. Wilson, eds., *New Testament Apocrypha: Gospels and Related Writings*, vol. 1, Rev. Ed. (London: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 558–560; J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 161–163.

(1.58). As Henry Chadwick states, Celsus confused Herod the Great (Matt 2:1-12, 16-18) and Herod the Tetrarch (Luke 3:1).⁸⁷ Interestingly, Origen does not correct this confusion (something he was apt to do) in his comments on Celsus' assertions (1.60-61, 66). Origen himself regularly writes about 'Herod' when referring to narratives of the gospels and Acts in which 'Herod' appears (1.51, cf. Matt 2:4-5; 1.58, cf. Matt 2:1-12, 16-18; Luke 3:1; 1.60-61, 66, cf. Matt 2:16-18; 2.45, cf. Acts 12:2) without distinguishing between the rulers behind the text. We simply do not know if Origen or his readers made any such distinctions. What we have here are two early interpreters of the gospels and Acts, Origen and Celsus, who may have read the various Herods of the NT as a single character.⁸⁸

Admittedly, not all of these examples are of the same type since some may be the creation of an author, others creations in the minds of readers, or some combination of authorial and readerly construction. What these examples do show is that literary analyses point to the plausibility a composite character appearing in Luke-Acts. The repetition of proper names can create difficulty delineating between historic individuals and possibly lead to reading distinct historic individuals as composite characters at the narrative level.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Henry Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum: Translated with an Introduction and Notes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 53, n. 4.

⁸⁸ Chrysostom noted a literary relationship between two Herods in his homily on Matt 2:16 (§ 1). He draws three parallels between the story of Herod's slaughter of the innocents (Matt 2:16-18) and Peter's escape from prison (Acts 12:3-19). First, both Jesus and Peter escape. Second, innocent parties are executed instead of the intended targets. Third, both stories involve Herod. Chrysostom does not conflate these two Herods, but his awareness of the similarities in the stories seems to stem from the recurrence of the name 'Herod'.

⁸⁹ Hippolyte Delehaye, *The Legends of the Saints: An Introduction to Hagiography*, trans. V. M. Crawford (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961), 16–24 shows that the tendency to conflate namesakes, even among the most significant personages in Christian history, is a tendency that was carried over from antiquity. For the opposite problem, that of different names occurring for the same person and the confusion that it may create even with a person as significant as Peter, see

I do not want to overstate the case. Many authors and readers from the antique period through to today interpret the gospels and Acts and distinguish the various Herods. Some of the examples above may be honest mistakes; others may be purposeful conflation. We simply do not know. We can only assess the documents in which composite characters appear, hence the methodology adopted for the present thesis. What the above examples do show us is that while it is possible to identify the various individuals that stand behind literary texts, when the portrayal of certain characters in literary works are analysed over against our historical knowledge of these individuals we sometimes see a composite character.

Answering a Potential Objection

At this point it is necessary to pause and respond to a potential objection that may be lodged against my proposal: that Luke and/or his readers would have known that the name ‘Herod’ refers to three different people in Luke-Acts. This is a historical matter and as such, ultimately falls beyond the scope of this thesis. However, a few words here will dispel this objection.

Concerning Luke, the author, in particular, we may address the matter of Luke’s dependence on Josephus. The objection would likely argue that if Luke knew the writings of Josephus, he surely would have gotten the Herods ‘right’. As we will see below, the overwhelming majority of information known to us about the Herods comes from the works of Josephus, especially his *Antiquities*, but even this major

Bart D. Ehrman, ‘Cephas and Peter,’ *JBL* 109 (1990): 463–474; Donald W. Riddle, ‘The Cephas-Peter Problem, and a Possible Solution,’ *JBL* 59 (1940): 169–180; Kirsopp Lake, ‘Simon, Cephas, Peter,’ *HTR* 1921 (1921): 95–97.

work provides relatively little information about the Herods other than Herod the Great.⁹⁰ Bruce states that the belief that Luke knew Josephus rests primarily on three points: 1) the naming of Lysanias the Tetrarch who is otherwise unknown (Luke 3:1; cf. *Ant.* 19.275; 20.138), 2) the chronological reversal (and anachronistic for Gamaliel's speech) of Theudus' and Judas' respective rebellions (Acts 5:36; cf. *Ant.* 20.97-102), and 3) the oblique reference to an Egyptian rebel (Acts 21:38; cf. *War* 2.254-263; *Ant.* 20.167-172).⁹¹ While the modern biblical scholar or historian has the luxury of repeatedly poring over Josephus' narratives, this seems to be a luxury that the author of Luke-Acts did not share. As the final 'publication' of *Antiquities* likely post-dates the composition of Luke-Acts by several years, Luke's dependence upon the completed work would be impossible.⁹² However, even granting for the sake of the argument of my potential interlocutors that Luke was dependent upon *Antiquities* is not damning for my argument as I will show that Luke's presentation of the Herods differs from Josephus' at two key points. In other words, if Luke used *Antiquities* as a source, then we may safely conclude that Luke altered his presentation of the Herods to suit his own purposes. In my argument, one way to

⁹⁰ Nikos Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty* (JSPSS 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 195 states that this is especially true for the period from 6-36 CE. Nikos Kokkinos, 'Which Salome Did Aristobulus Marry?', *PEQ* 118 (1986): 40-41 preferring the evidence of the canonical gospels to that of Josephus in his proposal that Philip the Tetrarch was the second husband of Herodias states, 'That there should have been confusion, even in the first century, is not surprising, given the genealogical complexities of the Herodian house'. See also Richardson, *Herod*, 314.

⁹¹ Bruce, *Acts*, 43-44.

⁹² See Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 53-54; Keener, *Acts 1:1-2:47*, 394; Dicken, 'Author and Date,' 24-25. Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2006), chapter five, is the most significant argument for Luke's dependence on Josephus. Though Luke may have known Josephus' *War*, Pervo's argument advocates for Luke's dependence on *Antiquities*. Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), chapter six (his conclusion is found on 292-293), also advocates for Luke's dependence on *Antiquities*. Mason does allow that Luke and Josephus drew upon similar sources or traditions, but finds it unlikely. We might also posit that Luke had heard or read what we might call a 'pre-publication' version of *Antiquities*.

account for these alterations is to construe Luke's 'Herod' as a composite character. If Luke did not make use of *Antiquities*, then we must account for the differences between Luke's portrayal of the Herodian rulers and those known not only from Josephus, but from other literary and archaeological evidence as well. Once again, in my argument, a way to account for these differences is to construe Luke's 'Herod' as a composite character. In any event, our configuration of the relationship between Luke-Acts and *Antiquities* is useful for my thesis as it highlights the differences between the narrative depictions of the Herodian rulers by each author.⁹³

With regard to both Luke and his readers, from a historical perspective we must concede that it is impossible to know precisely what ancient writers and readers in early Christian communities would have known about historical personages, though we may posit a few conjectures. As we would expect, and as the multiple references in both the gospels and other literature bear out, Herod the Great was both the most significant member of the Herodian dynasty as well as the most often remembered.⁹⁴ We should not, however, overestimate Herod's fame. There are a few inscriptions outside Palestine and based on the extant literary evidence, it seems that he was remembered as a relatively significant eastern king, noted for his building projects and perhaps his tyrannical nature.⁹⁵ As for the later Herods, it is even more difficult to determine what ancient writers and readers knew about them. The references to the later Herods in historical sources other than Josephus outside the

⁹³ See chapter four below.

⁹⁴ Louis H. Feldman, *Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary: Judean Antiquities 1-4* (ed. Steve Mason; vol. 3; Brill Josephus Project; Leiden: Brill, 2000), xxxiii.

⁹⁵ Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, Vol. 2: From Tacitus to Simplicius (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980), 409 (600) states that later writers could use Herod's name without qualification because of his relative fame.

gospels are sparse and primarily deal with the problems surrounding the ratification of Herod the Great's final will. As for Herod Antipas, we know of two inscriptions outside of Palestine, and though his coins circulated in Galilee, they were not the most commonly used coins there.⁹⁶ The key memory of Agrippa I seems to have been his friendship with Gaius, which both Tacitus and Cassius Dio mention, and especially the king's intervention in the incident of Gaius' attempt to erect the statue in the Jerusalem Temple. While 'Agrippa' became a pious quasi-hero in the Rabbinic literature, we have discussed the confusion surrounding the specific identity of this 'Agrippa' above. So, while it seems that certain writers at times knew the Herods, it seems that even they knew very little about them based on the considerable scarcity of references to the rulers.

Further to this point, we may posit that ancient readers likely did not have accurate knowledge of the past, even their immediate pasts. Baumgarten writes to that effect stating, '[The] lack of accurate information concerning the past on both the Greco-Roman and Jewish side was not only characteristic of popular literature, but extended to more educated circles as well'.⁹⁷ Admittedly, Baumgarten's assertion is a conjecture. Perhaps we are wiser to return to the poignant, but more measured statements of Brown, 'One may well wonder whether early Christian hearers of the Gospel stories kept the various Herods distinct',⁹⁸ and 'Three men in the NT are

⁹⁶ See Morten Hørning Jensen, *Herod Antipas in Galilee*, WUNT 215 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 209–213.

⁹⁷ Albert I. Baumgarten, 'Rabbinic Literature as a Source for the History of Jewish Sectarianism in the Second Temple Period,' *DSD* 2 (1995): 17. It appears that κράτιστε Θεόφιλε (Luke 1:3) could be among these more educated readers.

⁹⁸ Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 2nd ed. (London: Chapman, 1993), 614. However, in his comments on the Lukan birth narrative, Brown does concede that the birth of Jesus took place during the reign of Herod the Great, see *Birth*, 265.

called Hērōdes: Herod the Great, Herod Antipas, and Herod Agrippa I.... How many hearers or readers would have known that these were three different men?’⁹⁹ We do not know what ancient readers would have known about the Herods, but we have shown above that several Christian authors, even in the earliest centuries, were confused about the Herods or conflated them.¹⁰⁰

Additionally, the appearance of composite characters in other texts did not seem to be a problem for either the authors or readers of those texts. In this way it follows that even if authors and readers knew that different individuals stood behind the texts in which composites occurred, they were willing to accept the appearance of a composite for the sake of the narrative in which the character appeared. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, this thesis is not concerned with what Luke and/or his readers knew, but only with presenting a plausible, alternative way of understanding the depiction of the Herods in Luke-Acts, namely that ‘Herod’ is a composite character.

Conclusion: Methodological Considerations and Composite Characters

As I have stated above, a composite character is a character that appears as a single individual in a narrative but is comprised of two or more historic individuals who stand behind the character. While composite characters may not be widespread in literature of any period, including the NT, in light of the foregoing examples, the methodology adopted here allows me to argue that the repetition of the name ‘Herod’

⁹⁹ Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, vol. 1 (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 784.

¹⁰⁰ Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 53 (75) notes that even the eminent Roman historian Tacitus (*Historiae*, V, 9.3 and *Annales*, XII, 23.1) is confused on certain points regarding the Herods.

and the consistency with which the author of Luke-Acts portrays 'Herod' lead us to view him as a composite character. As with the other composite characters discussed above, we can sometimes identify the various historic individuals behind the literary figures, sometimes we cannot. Comparing an author's work to what is known historically is the means by which we determine the presence of a composite character in a narrative work. In order to establish that this is the case for 'Herod' in Luke-Acts, we must examine the historical data concerning the Herodian rulers behind Luke's 'Herod' alongside Luke-Acts for comparison and contrast. This will show us where Luke has adapted his portrayal of them in creating the composite 'Herod'.

With regard to our historical sources for the Herodian rulers, we have Josephus' *Jewish War* and *Antiquities of the Jews*, and I will pay close attention to these narratives, realising that Josephus, like all authors, crafted his histories to suit his personal agendas. Other ancient historians mention various matters concerning the Herods in passing, but these add very little (if anything) to Josephus' accounts. There are also several inscriptions, numismatic data, and archaeological remains that we must consider in our brief biographical sketches of the Herods. The intention of this discussion is not to pit ancient authors against each other to see who was right and who was wrong. It is simply to compare and contrast Luke and Acts with other witnesses so that we may see the distinctive features of Luke-Acts that lead us to understand 'Herod' as a composite character.

Chapter 4: From Herodian Dynasty to Composite ‘Herod’

‘Herod’s was probably the most famous Judean name in the Mediterranean world.’¹

In this chapter we will provide brief biographical sketches of four Herodian rulers (Herod the Great, Herod Archelaus, Herod Antipas, and Agrippa I) who factor into our interpretation of ‘Herod’ as a composite character in Luke-Acts. As I have stated, a composite character is an amalgamation of several historic individuals that appears as a single character in a narrative. These biographical sketches will allow us to compare and contrast what we know about the historical individuals *behind* Luke’s narrative with the narrative of Luke-Acts in order to understand ‘Herod’ as a composite character.² Specifically, we will see that distinctive features in the presentation of the Herods appear at Luke 1:5 and Acts 12. In the former passage, the identity of ‘Herod, King of Judaea’ is ambiguous for two reasons: the lack of external attestation of the title ‘King of Judaea’ for any Herodian ruler and the problems concerning the dating of the census under Quirinius (Luke 2:1-2). In the latter passage, the name ‘Herod’ appears for Agrippa I, a name that is unattested in any extant literary or epigraphic evidence for this ruler. These two distinctive features will allow us to interpret all of Luke’s uses of the name Herod as a composite character, ‘Herod’.

¹ Louis H. Feldman, *Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary: Judean Antiquities 1-4*, ed. Steve Mason, vol. 3, Brill Josephus Project (Leiden: Brill, 2000), xxxiii.

² While there are three Herods *behind* Luke’s ‘Herod’, in this chapter we will focus on four: Herod the Great, Archelaus, Antipas, and Agrippa I. This is necessary because the ‘Herod’ of Luke 1:5 could be Herod the Great or Archelaus depending on how one construes the evidence.

Excursus: Josephus and the Herods

Before I present the biographical sketches of the Herods who appear in Luke-Acts, a note about the writings of Josephus is in order. Josephus' *Jewish War* and *Antiquities of the Jews* are the primary, and in many cases the only, sources for information about the Herodian rulers. However, we cannot slavishly follow his narratives. As Bond writes, Josephus 'was a skilful writer who tailored the material so that it cohered with his overarching dramatic, political and theological aims' and that Josephus' characters are not full-blown characters, but rather stage pieces that illustrate the key themes of his works.³ Therefore, before we utilise Josephus as a historical source, we must pause here to discuss his aims in *War* and *Antiquities* in relation to his presentation of the Herodian rulers.

Josephus, the Herods, and The Jewish War

The best place to begin to understand Josephus' literary aims is with the author's own words. Each of Josephus' writings contains a preface in which he spells out the specific aims of the works.⁴ The preface of *War* is 1.1-18. Here Josephus claims to be offering an eyewitness account of the Jewish war that could serve as a corrective⁵ to the accounts of the war written by non-Jews that only served to flatter the Romans (1.1-2). Claiming that the Jewish war against Rome was the greatest in history (1.1, 22),⁶ he states that ultimate responsibility for the revolt lies at the feet of a small number of Jews he labels τὸ νεωτερίζον (1.4) and οἱ Ἰουδαίων τύρπῃνοι (1.10). Josephus asserts that these factions incited the people to revolt in

³ Helen K. Bond, 'Josephus on Herod's Domestic Intrigue in the *Jewish War*,' *JSJ* 43 (2012): 296 and 300. To support her assertion regarding Josephus' characters, Bond cites Aristotle's discussion of characters in relation to plot as I have above with regard to Luke's characters.

⁴ Harold W. Attridge, 'Josephus and His Works,' in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Michael E. Stone, vol. 2, CRINT 2 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 195; Helgo Lindner, 'Eine offene Frage zur Auslegung des Bellum-Proömiums,' in *Josephus - Studien: Untersuchung zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem neuen Testament Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. Otto Betz, Klaus Haacker, and Martin Hengel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 254; Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Peabody: Hendricksen, 2003), 102.

⁵ We must hold in mind the caution of Steve Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees: A Composition-Critical Study* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), 76–79 that Josephus' claim of ἀλήθεια and ἀκρίβεια was common rhetorical convention.

⁶ No doubt, Josephus makes this claim so as to place himself among the great men of his day given his personal involvement in the war. So Attridge, 'Josephus and His Works,' 188, 192; Mason, *Josephus on the Pharisees*, 69.

the hope that the Jews of the Diaspora would join them in fighting the Romans.⁷ Placing blame on a small group of insurrectionists allows Josephus to: 1) exonerate the Jewish people who did not participate in the revolt and arouse sympathy for them (1.9-12)⁸ and 2) deny that the Romans are worthy of praise afforded them by other writers (1.7-8).⁹ However, while Josephus blames the insurrectionist party for the result of the war, he contends that what happened to the Jews was the will of God.¹⁰ Further, as Bilde points out, Josephus' speech at 5.362-419 'must be regarded as being extremely significant for the understanding of Josephus' political and theological attitude'.¹¹ In this speech the themes of blaming the revolutionaries and the outworking of the will of God come together in three ways when Josephus states that: 1) God granted the Romans supremacy, 2) Israel would be defeated because of the nation's failure to trust God's providence, and 3) the Jews would be defeated

⁷ Josephus lists five groups of insurrectionists at *War* 7.259-274: sicarii, John of Gischala and his followers, Simon bar Giora and his followers, Idumaeans, and zealots. See Louis H. Feldman, 'Flavius Josephus Revisited: The Man, His Writings, and His Significance,' in *Principat*, ed. Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase, vol. 2, ANRW 21 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984), 842.

⁸ See also *War* 3.108-109 where Josephus declares that he is not flattering the Romans, but comforting those who have been defeated by them and 5.19-20 where Josephus writes a lament for Jerusalem and immediately follows it with a claim to reign in his emotions in accord with the rules of writing history. See Mason, *Josephus on the Pharisees*, 68.

⁹ This is an interesting statement by Josephus since as Attridge, 'Josephus and His Works,' 186 points out, Josephus probably wrote under Flavian patronage. Henry St. John Thackeray, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1929), 27; Shaye J. D. Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome* (Boston: Brill, 2002), 86 are representative of those who view Josephus as a 'Flavian lackey' writing Imperial propaganda. Steve Mason, 'Should Any Wish to Enquire Further (Ant. 1.25): The Aim and Audience of Josephus' Judean Antiquities/Life,' in *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives*, ed. Steve Mason, JSPSS 32 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 73-74; Mason, *Josephus on the Pharisees*, 81 offers a corrective to the 'Flavian lackey' view of Josephus and rightly states that the primary aim of *War* is a defence of the Jews, though he is also cautious of seeing the Flavians as Josephus' primary patrons. Feldman, *Antiquities 1-4*, 3: xviii is also as cautious as Mason and states that Josephus was probably not as close to the Imperial family while writing *War* and not as far away while writing *Ant.* as is commonly assumed. Helen K. Bond, 'New Currents in Josephus Research,' *CRBS* 8 (2000): 171 states that while *War* is not propaganda it does cast Titus in a positive light. Also, Feldman, 'Flavius Josephus Revisited,' 840 reminds us that as Josephus drew on the memoirs of Vespasian and Titus he was bound to depict these leaders positively.

¹⁰ So Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*, SupNovT 64 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1992), 309. Daniel Schwartz, 'Herodians and Ioudaioi in Flavian Rome,' in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, ed. Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason, and James Rives (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 72 probably goes too far by elevating this to the level of Josephus' primary concern.

¹¹ Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works and Their Importance*, JSPSS 2 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998), 55. Scholars agree that the speeches in *War* are key to understanding Josephus' aims in that work, e.g., Attridge, 'Josephus and His Works,' 194-195; Seth Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaeon Politics*, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition XVII (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 28, 133; Daniel Schwartz, *Agrippa I: The Last King of Judaea*, TSAJ 23 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990), 65; Thackeray, *Josephus*, 42.

because of their sins.¹² In an interpretive aside, Josephus reiterates his claim that Jerusalem fell because God willed it (6.288-315).¹³ Thus, we may summarize Josephus' aim in *War*: to blame a small group of radical Jews (and exonerate the rest) for leading the whole nation into sin resulting in God's abandonment of the nation as evidenced in its defeat by the Romans.

How do the Herodian rulers fit into this picture? As a general statement, we may agree with Jensen who states that the picture of the Herodians in *War* is 'more detached and less personal' than the account in *Antiquities*.¹⁴ This is so because the Herods play a much less significant role in *War* than in *Antiquities*; outside of a few statements concerning Agrippa II in 3.445, 540; 4.498-500, the Herodians only appear in parts of books 1-2. On the whole, Josephus is more inclined to depict the earlier Herodians (Herod the Great, Archelaus, Antipas) both positively and negatively in support of his aims. With regard to the rulers' allegiance to Rome and the quelling of insurrection, Josephus depicts these rulers positively. His negative portrayal arises from their personal failings and strife within their own households. Alternatively, as tension between Jerusalem and Rome escalates in the narrative, two factors contribute to Josephus' increasingly, though not uniformly, positive depiction of Agrippa I and II: the kings' loyalty toward Rome and Josephus' emphatic claim that the Jewish people and their rulers were not responsible for the revolt.¹⁵ We must also remember that Agrippa II, who was likely Josephus' friend,¹⁶ was at the height of his power when *War* was written, which also probably resulted in his generally positive depiction.¹⁷

¹² Bilde, *Between Jerusalem and Rome*, 75 elaborates on this final point citing 2.455; 5.19 and adds that for Josephus Rome was a tool in God's hand used for punishing the Jewish people just as the Assyrians and Babylonians had been.

¹³ Cf. *War* 3.352-354 which is Josephus' prayer while hiding in the cave with the insurgents. In this recorded prayer he states very plainly that he knows that God has left the Jews and gone over to the Roman side.

¹⁴ Morten Hørning Jensen, *Herod Antipas in Galilee*, WUNT 215 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 89.

¹⁵ Feldman, *Antiquities 1-4*, 3: xxxiii; Cohen, *Josephus*, 97, n. 44.

¹⁶ Cf. *Life*, 364 where Josephus reports that Agrippa wrote sixty-two letters confirming the truth of Josephus' written report of the Jewish war.

¹⁷ See *Life* 353, 359-360; *Apion* 1.51. Also, Feldman, 'Flavius Josephus Revisited,' 819; Feldman, *Antiquities 1-4*, 3: xviii; Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaean Politics*, 133.

A few examples will illustrate these assertions. On a positive note, and in line with his purposes, Josephus clearly depicts Herod the Great as loyal to the Romans and their cause, leading eastern military campaigns as one of Antony's generals (1.303-385), pledging allegiance to Caesar after Antony's defeat at Actium (1.386-397), and building extensively in Palestine (1.401-430).¹⁸ Negatively, Herod is Josephus' prime illustration of his belief that monarchy is a flawed system of governance as compared to a theocracy under priestly rule.¹⁹ Also, Josephus notes Herod's Idumaean ancestry (1.123), later placing Idumaeans in company with the insurrectionists under John of Gischala (along with the Zealots) in defence of Jerusalem against the Romans (4.221-354). Though the Idumaeans left the fighting in Jerusalem after a period, they do not escape Josephus' scorn as they are listed among the insurrectionist groups at the end of the narrative (7.259-274). This characterisation of the Idumaeans does not, in and of itself, place Herod in the camp of the insurgents, but it does cast a pall over him and his family in *War*. Josephus' final assessment of Herod the Great involves the downward spiral of the waning years of king's personal life during his final years. Herod's paranoia led to increasing cruelty (1.534, 659-664) and the decimation of his family. He executed Hyrcanus, a wife, and several of his own children (1.431-497).²⁰ Josephus' final assessment of Herod the Great in *War* comes at 2.84-87: the king broke Jewish law, imposed suffering on many as a tyrannical ruler, caused the poverty of many in the nation, and brought the once glorious nation to a position nearly as low as their enslavement by the Babylonians.²¹ Thus, Josephus' depiction of Herod the Great in *War* is a progression from positive to negative.²²

¹⁸ As Bond, 'Herod's Domestic Intrigue,' 313 states, demonstrating Herod's (and by proxy, the Jewish populace's) loyalty to Rome is one of Josephus' primary goals of the Herod narrative. Bond also notes the encomiastic terms on which Josephus begins the story of Herod the Great in *War* (298-299).

¹⁹ Ibid., 309-313; Zuleika Rodgers, 'Monarchy vs. Priesthood: Josephus, Justus of Tiberias, and Agrippa II,' in *A Wandering Galilean: Essays in Honour of Sean Freyne*, ed. Zuleika Rodgers, Margaret Daly-Denton, and Anne Fitzpatrick McKinley (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 179. See Josephus' negative assessment of kingship in *Antiquities* as well.

²⁰ As Bond, 'Herod's Domestic Intrigue,' 303-307 notes, as Josephus' depiction of Herod turns negative, the king appears to lack control of himself and his household.

²¹ See Tamar Landau, *Out-Heroding Herod*, AGAJU 63 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 92-96 for a discussion of the function of obituaries in Josephus. As Landau states, this assessment of Herod would not elicit empathy from the reader.

²² Ibid., 107-108; Steve Mason, *Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary: Judean War 2*, vol. 1b, Brill Josephus Project (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 58, n. 522; Bond, 'Herod's Domestic Intrigue,' 297.

A similar pattern occurs with Herod's sons, Archelaus and Antipas. Initially, Josephus depicts Archelaus as a generous, loyal son who bestows proper funerary honours upon his father (1.602, 670-673; 2.2)²³ and refuses to be named king until Caesar finalised his father's final will (2.1-4). The turning point in the narrative is Archelaus' attempt to maintain the Roman peace during the Passover riot by killing approximately 3,000 potential insurrectionists (2.8-13). After this incident, Josephus has nothing positive to say about Archelaus. Upon Archelaus' arrival in Rome for Caesar's ratification of Herod the Great's will (which would make Archelaus king), Josephus states that most of Archelaus' supporters turned against him because they viewed him as unfit to rule (2.14-38, 84-91). Though Caesar ratifies Herod's will, he amends it and names Archelaus Ethnarch over half of Herod's territory with the provision that he could be made king if he governed well (2.93). The opportunity never came as Archelaus was deposed after an apparently tumultuous nine year reign (2.111-113).

Antipas receives less attention than Archelaus in *War*, but we still see a mixed portrayal by Josephus. Like Archelaus, Antipas also travelled to Rome to contest the supposed final will of his father because he had been named the sole heir to the throne in Herod's penultimate will (1.646). During the proceedings before Caesar, many of Archelaus' supporters went over to Antipas, not because they deemed him a better ruler, but because they viewed him as the lesser of two evils since direct Roman rule was not an option (2.80-100). Antipas' story ends badly as he and his wife are exiled to Spain by Gaius Caesar for their ambition in pursuing the kingdom that Gaius had granted to Agrippa I (2.181-183). As with Herod the Great, we see Josephus' mixed portrayal of these two sons of the king. The narratives of both rulers' lives illustrate Josephus' belief that one should not question the superiority of the Romans.²⁴

Finally, we turn to Agrippa I, grandson of Herod the Great. Josephus depicts this king in a more positive light, due primarily to Agrippa's loyalty to Rome. Apart from publicly voicing his support for Gaius over Tiberius and his subsequent imprisonment by Tiberius (2.181), Josephus shows Agrippa I to be fiercely loyal to

²³ We should, however, also bear in mind Josephus' own preference for simple funeral arrangements (*Apion* 2.205).

²⁴ Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 82 notes that Philip was the exception that proves the rule of bad Herodian rulers. This assessment may be a bit overstated since Philip plays a much smaller role in the narrative than even Antipas does.

Empire. He does so by omitting Agrippa's protestations to Gaius concerning the Emperor's desire to erect a statue of himself in the Jerusalem Temple (2.184-203),²⁵ narrating the king's intervention before the Roman Senate on behalf of Claudius (2.204-213), and his ceasing the construction of an additional wall around Jerusalem because he feared that it could be construed as an act of insurrection (2.218-219; cf. 5.152).²⁶ In *War*, Josephus depicts Agrippa I as loyal to Rome and avoiding even the appearance of revolutionary activity.

Josephus composed *War* shortly after the fall of Jerusalem. Having temporarily fought against the Romans in the revolt, Josephus displays two tendencies in *War*: he wished to distance himself from the rebels (who are to blame for the revolt) and to demonstrate his loyalty to Rome. In *War*, the Herodians share these two characteristics with Josephus and so generally are depicted by the author in this positive light. Josephus only casts the Herodians in a negative light when they counter Rome or exhibit personal failings.

Josephus, the Herods, and The Antiquities of the Jews

Josephus completed his *Antiquities* approximately fifteen years after *War*.²⁷ In the preface of *Antiquities*, which runs from 1.1-26, Josephus states the overarching moral lesson he wishes to convey through the work and his motives for writing. As to the moral purpose for the work, Josephus claims that those who obey the laws of God will prosper and those who do not obey will meet disastrous ends (1.14). So, Josephus urges his readers to devote themselves (προσάναγχειν)²⁸ to God, to emulate the life of the lawgiver, Moses (1.15), and to participate in God's virtue (1.24). As for motives, Josephus lists what he considered the four motives of historians: 1) to exhibit skill and gain fame, 2) to show favour to those about whom they write, 3) to relate a comprehensive narrative of events in which they were involved, and 4) to inform those who are ignorant of such events. He states that the

²⁵ This protest is included in *Ant.* 19.300-312.

²⁶ Compare to *Ant.* 19.327 where Josephus states that Claudius commanded Agrippa to cease building the wall. Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaeon Politics*, 130-131 maintains that the passages in *War* omit and/or deny Agrippa's tension with Claudius that is made explicit in *Ant.*

²⁷ Cf. *Ant.* 20.267; *Life* 5 where Josephus claims that the work was completed in Domitian's thirteenth year (ca. 93/94 CE).

²⁸ The term denotes the exhibition of piety (BDAG, 876). See *Ant.* 10.68, 104; 11.279 where it is found in exhortations to worship and serve the God of Israel.

third and fourth of these are his motives for composing *Antiquities*, though we should note that as Josephus concludes *Antiquities* he also claims motive one for himself (20.262-265) and, as a Jewish priest, he obviously shows favour to his people as he recounts their history (motive two).²⁹ In light of Josephus' statements and these observations, we may conclude that the *Antiquities* serves several purposes. First, the work assuages the curiosity of outsiders regarding the Jews.³⁰ Second, and related to this curiosity, the work serves as an apology for the Jewish people. In the wake of the Judaeo-Roman war, anti-Jewish sentiments likely abounded in the Roman Empire and the city of Rome in particular. Josephus' extensive attention to the great antiquity of the Jewish people and their institutions appears to be a response to these anti-Jewish attitudes, as he demonstrates that the Jews are a noble people who exemplify the values of Hellenistic society (morality, ethics, philosophy, etc.).³¹ Third, Josephus also has a moral purpose in view. The great figures of Jewish history, particularly Moses, become for Josephus illustrations of his contention that those who obey the Jewish laws will prosper and that those who do not meet tragic ends.³² This final purpose largely accounts for Josephus' extended interest in the Herodian family as he portrays these rulers as failing to live rightly (according to Josephus) and thereby leading not only their own lives in downward spirals that ended in several Herodians being exiled and others enduring gruesome deaths, but also resulting in the downfall of the entire nation at the hands of the Romans.

The Herods play a much more significant role in *Antiquities* than they do in *War*, with nearly one-third of the entire work devoted to the period of the Herodian dynasty (books 14-20). Josephus employs extensive characterisation of the Herods to illustrate his moral purpose: they are examples of those who do not live according to the Jewish constitution and therefore meet their appropriate disastrous ends (1.14).³³ In other words, they are negative examples whom Josephus' readers must not

²⁹ Given the immense scope of *Ant.*, it makes little sense for Sterling, *Historiography*, 242 to claim that Josephus did not employ his third motive.

³⁰ Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 2nd ed., 102.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 111-115; Bond, 'Josephus Research,' 172; Sterling, *Historiography*, 245, 308; Bilde, *Between Jerusalem and Rome*, 99.

³² Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 2nd ed., 116.

³³ *Ibid.*, 155.

emulate.³⁴ This assessment of the Herods derives from Josephus' anti-monarchy/pro-priesthood stance.³⁵ In the end, Josephus provides an overall evaluation of these rulers: their dynasty was extinguished by God because of the rulers' impiety.³⁶ Therefore, I agree with those scholars who believe that whereas Josephus' depictions of the Herodians in *War* were generally positive (though not entirely so), the opposite is true in *Antiquities*.³⁷ Again, a few examples will illustrate this point.

Herod the Great, whose story comprises most of books 14-17, is one of Josephus' most significant characters in *Antiquities*. As such, we agree with Feldman who urges interpreters to take Josephus' moralising about Herod seriously concerning the author's intentions.³⁸ Two features highlight Josephus' negative assessment of Herod: the king's death and Josephus' own editorial comments concerning the king. Regarding Herod's death, the story is well-known (cf. *Ant.* 17.146-148, 168-192). Josephus' claim that Herod's illness was God's punishment for his sins (*Ant.* 17.170), the narratives of Herod's increasingly wicked insanity (*Ant.* 17.174-178), Herod's ignoble suicide attempt (*Ant.* 17.184), and his prolonged, disgusting deterioration and death (*Ant.* 17.168-169) are especially illustrative of the author's moral aims.³⁹ Josephus' summary of Herod is that though he was sometimes favoured by fortune, he should ultimately be considered unfortunate because he was impious, a transgressor of Jewish traditions, sinful and morally polluted, concerned only for his personal honour, barbarous, enslaved to his

³⁴ So Feldman, *Antiquities* 1-4, 3: xxxii-xxxiii.

³⁵ See Bond, 'Herod's Domestic Intrigue,' 309-313; Rodgers, 'Monarchy vs. Priesthood,' 179-180. Several scholars have argued that the *Antiquities* evidences a concentric structure that centres on the destruction of the first Temple (book 10). See Feldman, *Antiquities* 1-4, 3: xxi; Bilde, *Between Jerusalem and Rome*, 88. Scholars argue that for Josephus the reason for the destruction of Solomon's Temple was the emergence and decline of monarchical rule in Israel. Accordingly, the reason for the destruction of the second Temple is the emergence of the Herodian monarchy. See Rodgers, 'Monarchy vs. Priesthood,' 180; Bilde, *Between Jerusalem and Rome*, 88-91; Landau, *Out-Heroding*, 22.

³⁶ Cf. *Ant.* 18.127-128. Schwartz, 'Josephus in Rome,' 76, with understatement, comments, '...piety was sorely lacking among the Herodians.'

³⁷ This is particularly true of Herod the Great as the next section demonstrates. Morten Hørning Jensen, 'Josephus and Antipas: A Case Study of Josephus' Narratives on Herod Antipas,' in *Making History: Josephus and Historical Method*, ed. Zuleika Rodgers, SJSJ 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 293 states this as bluntly as possible, '...Josephus is more judgmental [of the Herods] in *Antiquities*.'

³⁸ Feldman, *Antiquities* 1-4, 3: xxxiii.

³⁹ Compare the deaths of Apion (*Apion* 1.143), Jehoram (2 Chr 21:18-19), Antiochus IV (2 Macc 9:5-12), and Agrippa I (*Ant.* 19.345-352).

passions, found it a pleasure to kill his family members, cruel, tyrannical, partly responsible for the destruction of Jerusalem and, on the whole, unfortunate (*Ant.* 17.191-192).⁴⁰

Josephus' account of Archelaus' reign as Ethnarch of Judaea and Samaria in *Antiquities* parallels the account in *War* with one exception: Archelaus' marriage to Glaphyra, which Josephus describes as unlawful according to the Jewish constitution (*Ant.* 17.341).⁴¹ Considering this illicit marriage along with the accounts of the Passover massacre (*Ant.* 17.206-218), Archelaus' supporters deserting him during the contesting of Herod's final will (*Ant.* 17.224-249), his adoption of the moniker 'Herod' (*Ant.* 17.304),⁴² the failure to rule well enough for Augustus to make him king (*Ant.* 17.317), and his eventual banishment (*Ant.* 17.342-344), Archelaus is a ruler who fits the mould cast by his father.⁴³

The narrative of Antipas' reign in *Antiquities* is expanded compared to that of *War* and further demonstrates Josephus' increasingly negative appraisal of the Herodian dynasty. Josephus introduces Antipas as a Samaritan (*Ant.* 17.20), immediately casting him in a negative light as Samaritans are idol worshippers and enemies of the Jewish people.⁴⁴ Additionally, we may note Antipas' adoption of the family name 'Herod' (*Ant.* 18.27),⁴⁵ founding the city of Tiberias on sepulchres in violation of Jewish scruples (*Ant.* 18.38),⁴⁶ his marriage to Herodias (which parallels

⁴⁰ See Landau, *Out-Heroding*, 133, 183; Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 2nd Ed., 155–157; Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 70.

⁴¹ Josephus is likely referring to Deut 25:5-10 and levirate marriage which stipulated that if a woman had no children at the time of her husband's death she could marry her dead husband's brother in order to produce an heir. In this case, Glaphyra had three children with her first husband thereby making the marriage to Archelaus unlawful.

⁴² The adoption of the name aligns Archelaus with his father. The same is true of Antipas (below). All the coins of both Archelaus and Antipas bear only the name 'Herod' and their respective titles (Ethnarch and Tetrarch). See Ya'akov Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage: Herod the Great through Bar Cochba*, vol. 2 (New York: Amphora, 1982), 33, 40–41; Ya'akov Meshorer, *A Treasury of Jewish Coins* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2001), 79, 82.

⁴³ See Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 77–79.

⁴⁴ Josephus depicts Samaritans as idolatrous, under God's wrath, enemies of Jews, angry that the Jews were allowed to resettle Jerusalem after the exile and opposed them rebuilding the Temple, preserving their own form of worship, defiling the Jerusalem Temple with dead bodies on one occasion and killing several Galilean pilgrims who were travelling to Jerusalem to worship (9.288-290; 11.84, 88, 114-118, 174, 340-341; 12.10, 257; 18.30, 118-136). See Thackeray, *Josephus*, 59.

⁴⁵ See footnote 43 above on Archelaus' adoption of this name.

⁴⁶ Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 95. Also see *Life* 65 which indicates that Antipas' palace there contained forbidden images.

Archelaus' marriage to Glaphyra, *Ant.* 18.136),⁴⁷ the defeat of his armies at the hands of Aretas (which Josephus claims was the result of Antipas' execution of the righteous John the Baptist, *Ant.* 18.116-119), and his dishonourable exile to Lugdunum for aspiring to the throne (*Ant.* 18.240-255).⁴⁸ For Josephus in *Antiquities*, both Archelaus and Antipas are transgressors of the Jewish constitution and punished by God accordingly.

As with Archelaus and Antipas, Josephus' additions to his story of Agrippa I in *Antiquities* provide clues to his assessment of the king. Josephus narrates several of Agrippa I's more favourable attributes as he tells of the king offering appropriate worship (*Ant.* 19.293, 297) and opposing idolatry.⁴⁹ Alternatively, Josephus' narratives of Agrippa's numerous financial troubles demonstrate a punishment Agrippa endured for being unfaithful (*Ant.* 18.144-195). Further contributing to the negative picture of Agrippa, Josephus aligns him with Herod the Great as both share the epithet ὁ μέγας (*Ant.* 18.110, 142; only of Herod at 18.130). Further aligning grandson and grandfather, we may note that both Agrippa and Herod I contemplated suicide (*Ant.* 18.147; cf. 17.184), both built Greek style cities (*Ant.* 19.355; cf. 14.76), and both ruled the same territory (*Ant.* 19.274-277).⁵⁰ Finally, Josephus' description of Agrippa's death is reminiscent of Herod's with both kings brought

⁴⁷ Ibid., 96; Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 2nd Ed., 157.

⁴⁸ Here, Josephus amends his earlier statement that Antipas and Herodias were banished to Spain (*War* 2.181-183). As for Josephus' portrayal of Antipas I agree with Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 99 who writes,

...it becomes clear in the light of the general survey of Josephus' treatment of the Herodian house that Josephus wants to present Antipas as another example of a bad Herodian ruler who was not able to safeguard the ancient and stable Jewish way of life. Antipas eventually comes to serve as a warning of how the deity punishes those not living in accordance with the law, as stated in the case of John the Baptist and in the narrative on Antipas' banishment.

I do, however, disagree with Jensen, 'Josephus and Antipas,' 307-308 who believes that Antipas' Passover sacrifice at *Ant.* 18.122 is an exception to his negative portrayal. Antipas was in Jerusalem only because he had been marching through Judaea with Vitellius' army, which was accompanied by what the Jewish leaders deemed idolatrous standards (18.121). We must also remember that this march, even after the stop in Jerusalem, ended in the defeat of Antipas' and Vitellius' forces by Aretas.

⁴⁹ *Ant.* 18.296-301 tells of Agrippa's intervention with Gaius who had desired to set up a statue of himself in the Jerusalem Temple; 19.300-312 narrates Agrippa's order to have the statue of Caesar removed from the synagogue of Doris.

⁵⁰ Josephus' claim that Agrippa was unlike Herod the Great pertains only to their respective temperaments (19.328-331). Where Herod was severe, ill-tempered, merciless, and friendlier to Greeks than Jews, Agrippa was generous, mild-tempered, and careful to obey Jewish law (though note Agrippa's building of Greek style cities as well as his retreat to Tiberias, a city laden with negative connotations since its founding by Antipas, after building Berytus at *Ant.* 19.338).

low by pain in their bellies (*Ant.* 19.346; cf. 17.169) because of their impiety (*Ant.* 19.345-347; cf. 17.170) and quickly forgotten after their deaths (*Ant.* 19.359).⁵¹

As with *War*, in *Antiquities* the Herodians serve to illustrate Josephus' purposes well. Though the characters exhibit a few positive qualities, they are regularly depicted as law-breakers, thus serving as negative examples of what happens when one fails to live according to the Jewish constitution. In accord with Josephus' opening words (1.14), God punishes them, removing two of them from rule and banishing them to remote countries. In the cases of two others, God causes their painful deaths.

Conclusions: Josephus and the Herods

There are four conclusions to be drawn regarding this excursus and its relation to the thesis. First, for the purposes of the present chapter, as we attempt to construct a biographical sketch of each ruler, we must attempt to discern how Josephus' rhetoric shaped his depiction of the rulers. Second, the similarities that the Herodian kings and rulers shared in life (their building projects, multiple marriages, impiety with regard to the Jewish law, even the name 'Herod' for some) resulted in their similar literary depiction and close narrative alignment by Josephus. This close alignment in Josephus' extensive writings is likely an indication of how the family of Herod the Great was remembered in the late first century and may provide a clue as to how and/or why another author of a less comprehensive narrative (e.g., Luke writing Luke-Acts) would collapse several of the rulers into a single character. Third, this close alignment of the Herods by Josephus results in the progressive vilification of the Herodian family from *War* to *Antiquities* with the latter text providing an example contemporaneous with Luke-Acts of an overwhelmingly negative portrayal of the Herodians.⁵² Fourth, in Josephus we see the negative portrayals of characters illustrating the key themes of his works, as we will see below in chapter six with Luke's composite 'Herod'. Therefore, evaluating the

⁵¹ On the similarities between Agrippa I and the other Herodian rulers in Josephus see Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 2nd Ed., 157–158; Schwartz, *Josephus and Judaeae Politics*, 151.

⁵² Luke-Acts was likely composed in the mid-80s CE and *Antiquities* was completed 93/94 CE. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, AB 31 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 54; Frank E. Dicken, 'Author and Date of Luke-Acts,' in *Issues in Luke-Acts*, ed. Michael Pahl and Sean Adams (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012), 24–25. We could also cite the negative portrayal of the Herods in the first gospel (cf. Matt 2:1-22; 14:1-12).

Herods as characters in Josephus' writings creates an awareness of the greater rhetorical strategies at work in Josephus' portrayals of these characters. This is important as we depend heavily on Josephus in our attempt to reconstruct the historic individuals behind the narrative of Luke-Acts. In other words, we cannot assume that these narratives relate an unbiased, straightforward account of any Herodian ruler's life. With this understanding in place we may now proceed to our brief biographical sketches of the Herods that factor into our understanding of Luke's composite 'Herod'.

Biographical Sketches of the Herods behind Composite 'Herod'

The sketches below will, to a large extent, depend upon a critical reading of the narratives in Josephus' *War* and *Antiquities* as these works are our greatest source of information on the Herodian rulers. I will incorporate other literary sources as well as epigraphic evidence where available. What follows here will be nothing more than a brief outline of the respective rulers' lives.⁵³ The purpose of this sketch is to provide a 'control' with which we will compare and contrast Luke-Acts in order to discover the distinctive features of the depictions of the Herods in Luke-Acts that result in a composite 'Herod'.⁵⁴

⁵³ Full historical and biographical treatments are available elsewhere. See the monumental Nikos Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty*, JSPSS 30 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998). Also see Abraham Schalit, *König Herodes: der Mann und sein Werk*, 2. Auflage mit einem Vorwort von Daniel R. Schwartz (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), 41; Stewart Perowne, *The Life and Times of Herod the Great* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Inc., 1957); Michael Grant, *Herod the Great* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971); Peter Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996); Harold W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas: A Contemporary of Jesus Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980); Stewart Perowne, *The Later Herods* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Inc., 1958); Jensen, *Herod Antipas*; Schwartz, *Agrippa I*; Wirgin Wolf, *Herod Agrippa I*, vol. 6, LUOSMS 10a, 10b (Leeds: Leeds University Oriental Society, 1968).

⁵⁴ I will not offer a sketch of the lives of Philip the Tetrarch and Agrippa II since this thesis focuses on the repetition of the name 'Herod' in Luke-Acts and these two rulers appear with their own names in Luke 3:1 and Acts 25:13—26:32 respectively. They do not stand behind Luke's composite character, 'Herod'.

Herod the Great

The patriarch and namesake of the Herodian dynasty was born in the 70s BCE and because of his political acumen experienced much prosperity in the period when Rome was transitioning from republic to empire. Herod was made στρατηγός of Galilee at age fifteen⁵⁵ and after putting down the brigands led by Hezekiah on the Syrian border, bought the office of governor of Coele-Syria from Sextus Caesar (*Ant.* 14.158-180). Following this, during the turbulent years after Julius Caesar's assassination, Herod allied himself with the various Romans who controlled the east, first Cassius, then Antony, and finally Octavian. After Cassius was defeated at Philippi (42 BCE), Antony made Herod the τετράρχης of Galilee (*Ant.* 14.324-326).⁵⁶ In 40 BCE, Herod fled Judaea in the wake of the Parthian invasion (during which Antigonus was made king) and travelled to Rome. In Rome, Antony and Octavian both supported Herod before the Senate, noting his friendship toward Rome,⁵⁷ and Herod was made king of the Jews (*Ant.* 14.381-385). In order to take up his kingship, Herod joined forces with the governor of Syria in laying siege to Jerusalem for two and one-half years,⁵⁸ eventually taking the city in 37 BCE and assuming his post as King of the Jews.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Schalit, *König Herodes*, 41.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 69.

⁵⁷ On Herod as friend of Rome, see the two inscriptions referred to in notes 64 and 65 below which note Herod's friendship with the Emperor.

⁵⁸ Schalit, *König Herodes*, 89–92.

⁵⁹ Richardson, *Herod*, 161.

The first few decades of Herod's rule were incredibly prosperous, though not without problems.⁶⁰ After an initial period of quelling strife in his own house and kingdom Herod's power grew immensely. Herod successfully transferred his support from Antony to Octavian after the battle of Actium in 31 BCE, and as a result Octavian expanded Herod's territory (*War* 1.387-400). It was during these prosperous years that Herod undertook his major building projects: cities (Sebaste,⁶¹ Caesarea Maritima,⁶² and others), palaces/fortresses (Herodium,⁶³ Jericho, Masada, Jerusalem), and the Jerusalem Temple. Herod's support and friendship with Rome grew during these years as well, evidenced by Josephus' description of him as φίλου καὶ συμμάχου (*Ant.* 17.246) of Caesar and inscriptions referring to him as φιλορωμαῖον⁶⁴ and ΦΙΛΟ[ΚΑΙΣΑΡ].⁶⁵

The last decade of Herod's life presented a marked contrast to the prosperous years that preceded it. Though the king had always been paranoid and overly

⁶⁰ Herod executed forty-five supporters of Antigonus (*Ant.* 15.6). The King appointed a friend, Hananel, to the high-priesthood, which enraged Alexandra, who rightfully viewed her son Aristobulus III as rightful heir, thereby forcing Herod to name Aristobulus III high priest. Herod would, in turn, have Aristobulus drowned because he perceived the high priest to be a political threat (*Ant.* 15.22-56). Further, after being presented with evidence of Mariamme's adultery with Herod's brother-in-law, Joseph (whom he also executed), and her increasing distrust of her husband, the King executed Mariamme, a decision he immediately regretted (*Ant.* 15.80-87, 218-246).

⁶¹ Strabo, *Geog.* 14.2.34 [Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, Vol. 1: From Herodotus to Plutarch (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974), 299].

⁶² The founding of Caesarea is noted by Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historiae*, V, 69 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 469 (471)]. Also, Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae*, XIV, 8.11-12 [Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, Vol. 2: From Tacitus to Simplicius (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980), 604] notes that Herod founded Caesarea in honour of Octavian.

⁶³ Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historiae*, V, 70 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 1: 469 (471)] lists Herodium alongside the other toparchies of Judaea.

⁶⁴ *OGIS*, vol. 1, #414 (627-628). See also Richardson, *Herod*, 204, 207.

⁶⁵ Ya'akov Meshorer, 'A Stone Weight from the Reign of Herod,' *IEJ* 20 (1970): 97; Richardson, *Herod*, 204.

protective of his throne,⁶⁶ he grew increasingly so during these waning years,⁶⁷ executing Alexander and Aristobulus (the sons of Mariamme).⁶⁸ These two sons had garnered popular support because of their Hasmonean lineage (*Ant.* 16.394) and plotted to kill Herod (because he had murdered their mother). Herod also executed the next son in line for the throne, Antipater, because Antipater (who had been imprisoned by Herod) presumed to claim the kingdom for himself after misinterpreting a scream let out by Herod during a failed suicide attempt as the king's death (*Ant.* 17.184-187).⁶⁹ Five days after his failure to take his own life, Herod succumbed to an assortment of health problems and died in 4 BCE.⁷⁰ His kingdom was divided between three of his sons and his sister (*Ant.* 17.188-190).⁷¹

Herod Archelaus

Archelaus was born ca. 27 BCE, the oldest son of Herod the Great and his Samaritan wife, Malthace.⁷² Nothing is known of Archelaus until the time of his father's death. Following Herod the Great's death, there was significant confusion surrounding the succession to the throne because of Herod having revised his will

⁶⁶ See above on the executions of Aristobulus III and Mariamme.

⁶⁷ Schalit, *König Herodes*, 605–610, 648-656.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 624–625.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 642-643. We may also refer to Matthew's report of the slaughter of infants in Bethlehem as part of Herod's paranoia (Matt 2:16).

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 643–644.

⁷¹ In addition to Josephus, on the division of Herod's kingdom upon his death, Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 1: 252 (255) cites a fragment of Nicolaus' *History* found in Constantinus Porphyrogenitis' *Excerpta de Insidiis* that names Archelaus as Ethnarch and Philip and Antipas as Tetrarchs. Tacitus, *Historiae*, 9.2 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 21 (29)] also mentions the division of Herod's kingdom but does not name the heirs.

⁷² Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 225.

multiple times. In particular, Herod had named Archelaus' brother, Antipas, the sole heir of his kingdom in his penultimate will,⁷³ but changed his wishes shortly before he died, dividing the kingdom among three of his sons (Archelaus, Antipas, and Philip) and his sister, Salome (*Ant.* 17.188-189).⁷⁴ After arranging Herod's funeral (*War* 1.602, 670-673; 2.2; *Ant.* 17.196-205),⁷⁵ Archelaus put down a riot during the Passover festival with excessive force resulting in approximately 3,000 casualties (*Ant.* 17.206-218; *War* 2.1-13). After this event, the three brothers named as successors in Herod's final will travelled to Rome with their respective delegations to argue their cases concerning the ratification of the will before Caesar. Augustus ratified Herod's final will with one amendment. Instead of Archelaus being named King over Judaea, Samaria, and Idumaea, Caesar made him Ethnarch of these territories with the promise that if Archelaus governed well, he would be King (*Ant.* 17.317; *War* 2.93-94).⁷⁶

Archelaus did not govern well, and though little is known of his reign as Ethnarch, it appears to have been turbulent. The details surrounding Archelaus' demise are also unclear. What seems evident is that his subjects considered him a tyrant, as Josephus tells of a delegation of Jews and Samaritans travelling to Rome in order to report as much to Caesar (*Ant.* 17.342-344). Cassius Dio claims that both Philip and Antipas also went to Rome at this time to bring accusations concerning

⁷³ Schalit, *König Herodes*, 637.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 262-264, 642-643.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 643-644.

⁷⁶ See also the fragment of Nicolaus' *History* in Constaninus Porphyrogenitis, *Excerpta de Insiidiis* [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 1: 252 (255)]; Schalit, *König Herodes*, 262-264.

Archelaus before Caesar.⁷⁷ While Antipas and Philip were allowed to continue ruling their respective tetrarchies, Augustus deemed Archelaus too incompetent to continue his rule, ending Archelaus' reign as Ethnarch after only ten years.⁷⁸ Augustus banished Archelaus to Vienne in Gaul and initiated direct Roman rule over his territory (*Ant.* 17.342-348).⁷⁹

Herod Antipas

Antipas was born ca. 25 BCE to Herod the Great and Malthace.⁸⁰ All we know of his childhood is that he was educated in Rome.⁸¹ Herod the Great's final will named him Tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea and he assumed this post after Caesar ratified that will (see above, *Ant.* 17.317-321; *War* 2.93-94).⁸² After Archelaus' banishment, Antipas adopted the name 'Herod'.⁸³ Like his father, Antipas was a

⁷⁷ Cassius Dio, *Historia*, LV, 27.6 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 364]. Strabo, *Geog.* 16.2.46 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 1: 299] makes the general comment that all of Herod's sons were unsuccessful. See also Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 103.

⁷⁸ In *War* 2.111-113 Josephus claims that Archelaus ruled for nine years. See Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 228.

⁷⁹ See Cassius Dio, *Historiae*, LV, 27.6 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 364].

⁸⁰ Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 225; Schalit, *König Herodes*, 263-264, 642.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 413.

⁸² See the fragment of Nicolaus' *History* in Constantinus Porphyrogenitis, *Excerpta de Insidiis* [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 1: 252 (255)]. All of Antipas' coins refer to him as ΗΡΩΔΟΥ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ or ΗΡΩΔΗΣ ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΗΣ. See Meshorer, *Treasury*, 82; Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, 2:40-41. Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 209-211 reconstructs two inscriptions, one from Cos and another from Delos, that refer to Antipas as 'Herod, son of Herod the King, Tetrarch'. On these inscriptions, see also Richardson, *Herod*, 208.

⁸³ The coins of Archelaus and Antipas show their adoption of the name 'Herod'. See Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, 2:33, 40-41; Meshorer, *Treasury*, 79, 82. Also see Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 104-106. The name 'Archelaus' does not appear on any extant coins. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 365 notes that Josephus never refers to Archelaus as 'Herod,' but cf. *Ant.* 17.304. Josephus only refers to Antipas as 'Herod' after Archelaus' banishment. Cassius Dio, *Historiae*, LV, 27.6 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 364] names Archelaus ὁ Ἡρώδης ὁ Παλαιστίνος.

builder (though on a much smaller scale), founding the cities of Tiberias in Galilee⁸⁴ and Julias in Peraea as well as building walls around Sepphoris, which he renamed Autocratoris in honour of the Emperor (*Ant.* 18.27; *War* 2.167-168). Antipas' downfall began with his divorce from his first wife, the daughter of Aretas, the king of Arabia/Nabataea. The divorce allowed him to marry Herodias, who had been married to his otherwise unknown half-brother, Herod.⁸⁵ Aretas took offence and attacked Antipas' army, defeating the Tetrarch's forces.⁸⁶ According to Josephus, Herodias would also be the source of Antipas' ultimate downfall as she persuaded the Tetrarch to travel to Rome to vie for the kingship that Gaius had granted to Agrippa I.⁸⁷ While in Rome, Agrippa informed Gaius of Antipas' standing army and military alliances, a charge that Antipas could not deny. Subsequently, Gaius banished Antipas to Lugdunum in Gaul in 39 CE,⁸⁸ thus ending the lengthy and relatively peaceful reign of Antipas over Galilee and Peraea (*Ant.* 18.240-255; *War* 2.181-183).⁸⁹

⁸⁴ Julian, *Ad Tiberiopolitas* [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 570] notes that Tiberias was founded by Herod (with no further identification), though he states that it is a πόλις τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

⁸⁵ Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 135, n. 7; Richardson, *Herod*, 307–308, n. 59. Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 266–269 argues that Herodias was married both to the unknown Herod and Philip the Tetrarch.

⁸⁶ Josephus blamed Antipas' loss in the war on his execution of John the Baptist (*Ant.* 18.109-116, 136).

⁸⁷ Herodias' influence over Antipas is a literary trope meant to cast the ruler in a negative light. Discussing the portrayal of Cleopatra's influence over Antony in Plutarch's *Lives*, Kate Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 11 writes, 'We learn from the *Lives* that when women and their influence are discussed, their appearance should be read as a sign that a man's character is in question, whether its virtue is to be defended or its dissolution illustrated'. See also Bond, 'Herod's Domestic Intrigue,' 302–303.

⁸⁸ Josephus writes that Gaius, knowing that Herodias was Agrippa's sister, attempted to give her a monetary gift and informed her that Agrippa had asked that she be spared the same fate as Antipas. However, Josephus states that she declined Gaius' gifts and chose to follow her husband into exile (*Ant.* 18.253-255).

⁸⁹ Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 254 concludes that Antipas' reign and impact on Galilee may be summed up as 'minor, moderate, adjusted and unremarkable.'

Agrippa I

Agrippa was born ca. 10 BCE to Aristobulus and Berenice. He was brought up in Rome, receiving his education there and was a childhood friend of Tiberius' son, Drusus, as well as the future Emperor, Claudius. His early life was marked by terrible financial problems (*Ant.* 18.144-154). However, his fortunes changed when Gaius became Emperor and granted Agrippa rule over the tetrarchies formerly ruled by Philip and Lysanias, eventually adding Antipas' territories upon the latter Tetrarch's deposition and naming Agrippa 'King of the Jews' (*Ant.* 18.228-237).⁹⁰ The most notable moment of Agrippa's brief reign was his intervention in the matter of Gaius' attempt to set up a statue of himself in the Jerusalem Temple.⁹¹ Though the precise details are unknown as Josephus' two accounts differ somewhat, it appears that Agrippa leveraged his friendship with Gaius to persuade the Emperor not to follow through with his desire.⁹²

Following Gaius' death, Agrippa encouraged Claudius to claim the Imperial throne and persuaded the Roman Senate to accept Claudius as Emperor (*Ant.* 19.236-273; *War* 2.206-217). Claudius, in turn, made Agrippa king over all of Herod the

⁹⁰ See also Philo, *Flacc.* 25; Cassius Dio, *Historiae*, LIX, 8.2; LX, 8.2-3 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 366, 368]; Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 93.

⁹¹ Josephus leaves much untold regarding this incident, but there is a lengthy narrative in Philo, *Gaius* §§ 261-334.

⁹² See *Ant.* 18.296-301; *War* 2.184-203. On the differences between Josephus' accounts, see Schwartz, *Agrippa I*, 18-23, 86-87, 90. Tacitus, *Historiae*, V, 9.2 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 29] claims that Gaius was not able to set up the statue because of his death. Cassius Dio, *Historiae*, LIX, 24.1 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 367] notes Agrippa's friendship with Gaius. Two of Agrippa's coins evidence his friendship with the Emperor and Rome. The inscriptions read ΒΑΣ ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΦΙΛΟΚΑΙΣΑΡ and ΒΑΣ[ΙΛΕΩΣ] ΜΕ[ΓΑΛΟΥ] ΑΓΡΙΠΠΑ ΣΕΒ[ΑΣΤΟΥ] ΚΑΙΣ[ΑΡΟΣ] Κ[ΑΙ] ΔΗΜΟ[Υ] ΡΩΜ[ΑΙΩΝ] ΦΙΛΙ[Α]Κ[ΑΙ]ΣΥΜΜΑΧ[ΙΑ] ΑΥΤ[ΟΥ] (A vow and treaty of friendship and alliance between the great king Agrippa and Augustus Caesar and the people of Rome). See Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, 2: 52-53, 55-56.

Great's former territory (*Ant.* 19.274-277; *War* 2.215).⁹³ Agrippa's reign as king was short-lived. In 44 CE, Agrippa died in Caesarea after being struck by an illness during an address to a crowd that had hailed him as divine.⁹⁴

Distinctive Features of the Depiction of the Herods in Luke-Acts

With these biographical sketches in place, we may now examine the two key distinctive features concerning the Herods. I grant that nearly everything contained in Luke-Acts concerning the Herods finds no attestation outside these writings save the rule of some during Tiberius' emperorship (Luke 3:1-2), Antipas' execution of John the Baptist (Luke 9:9), Agrippa I's death (Acts 12:20-23), and Agrippa II's rule. Even a cursory reading of these stories in Luke-Acts (or the other synoptic gospels in the case of Antipas and John the Baptist) alongside Josephus, the sole witness for most of what is known concerning the Herods, will show that the accounts of each of these matters are shaped to conform to the larger agendas of the narratives in which they occur. Also, the remainder of the incidents narrated in Luke-Acts concerning the Herods (e.g., Antipas' hostility toward Jesus and involvement in Jesus' trial and

⁹³ Schwartz, *Agrippa I*, 91–93; Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 289.

⁹⁴ The story of Agrippa's death is recounted in *Ant.* 19.343-353 and Acts 12:20-23. In the statement above, I have given the bare details on which both accounts agree. On the differences between Josephus' and Luke's accounts, see O. Wesley Allen, Jr., *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS 158 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 5–13. As Susan Garrett, 'Exodus from Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1-24,' *CBQ* 52 (1990): 676 notes, both Josephus and Luke have shaped the narrative of Agrippa's death to suit their own theological purposes. Precisely because each author has shaped the narrative to suit his own purposes, the historicity of both accounts may be questioned. However, these are the only two sources that recount Agrippa I's death and a historical reconstruction such as the one attempted here must be made based on *Antiquities* and Acts. Agrippa's son, Agrippa II, was deemed too young to immediately succeed his father, so Agrippa I's territory reverted to direct Roman rule. Agrippa II was initially allowed to rule the Kingdom of Chalcis. In 48 CE, Claudius granted Agrippa II the former tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias, and in 55 CE Nero expanded his territory to include Galilee and Peraea (*Ant.* 19.360-362; 20.138, 159; *War* 2.247, 252). Agrippa II subsequently ruled territories adjacent to Judaea alongside as well as superintended the Temple until the Jewish revolt of 66-70 CE.

death [cf. Luke 13:31; 23:6-12; Acts 4:25-27] or Agrippa I's hostility toward the apostles and the Jerusalem church [cf. Acts 12:1-5]) are not recounted elsewhere. So, in many ways, the depiction of the Herods in Luke-Acts is wholly distinctive and while external attestation for these events (and for many of the events narrated in Josephus) would be useful for full historical reconstruction of the lives of the various rulers of the Herodian dynasty, my purpose here is more modest. I simply want to show the distinctive features in the narrative depiction of the Herodian rulers in Luke-Acts for which we do possess external attestation. Therefore, while Luke-Acts identifies Herod Antipas correctly from a historical perspective (cf. Luke 3:1), I am contending that from a text-based, narrative perspective the Herods named at Luke 1:5 and Acts 12, who are not Herod Antipas, may be conflated with the Herod of Luke 3:1—Acts 4:27⁹⁵ because of incongruities between the presentation of these Herods in Luke-Acts and in other sources.

Herod, King of Judaea (Luke 1:5)

In the discussion of composite characters above, we saw that these characters appear in narrative works when we may discern that two or more historic individuals stand behind the composite character. Therefore, though the identification of 'Herod, King of Judaea' at Luke 1:5 is up for debate, what is not debateable is that the historic individual to whom the name and title refers is *not* the same person to whom later occurrences of the name 'Herod' refer historically (i.e., either Antipas or Agrippa). This is the historical conclusion that is necessary to draw *before*

⁹⁵ The name 'Herod' also appears for Antipas at Acts 13:1 and Herod the Great at Acts 23:35.

determining that Luke's narrative 'Herod' is a composite.⁹⁶ Therefore, I will examine two factors that complicate the identification of the historic individual to whom Ἡρώδης βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας might refer: no Herodian ruler ever held this specific title and Luke's reference to Quirinius' census at Luke 2:1-2.

Given the dramatic and antagonistic role of Herod the Great in the Matthean birth narrative and subsequent Christian harmonisations of the Matthean and Lukan nativity stories,⁹⁷ scholars assume that Luke has Herod the Great in view here, and they are likely correct given the probable dates of Herod's death and Jesus' birth.⁹⁸ Most importantly for our purposes, in contrast with what we have seen above in our biographical sketches of the Herods, no Herodian ruler ever held the title 'King of Judaea'.

According to Josephus, Cassius promised Herod the Great that he would be βασιλέα τῆς Ἰουδαίας (*Ant.* 14.280), but when Herod became king the title was

⁹⁶ I will discuss the interchangeable nature of the titles 'King of Judaea' and 'Tetrarch of Galilee' below.

⁹⁷ Paul Minear, 'Luke's Use of Birth Stories,' in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 126 rightly points out that we must resist the temptation to read Luke's birth narratives in light of Matthew's given the differences between the two.

⁹⁸ E.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, AB 28 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), 306; Craig Evans, *Luke*, NIBC 3 (Peabody: Hendricksen, 1990), 21, 27; Luke T. Johnson, *Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 32; I. Howard Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 51; Francois Bovon, *Luke 1*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002), 33; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 75; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 62, 64; John Nolland, *Luke 1:1-9:20*, WBC 35a (Waco: Word, 1989), 25; Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, 5th ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1901), 8; Christopher Francis Evans, *Saint Luke*, TPINTC (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1990), 145; Harold W. Hoehner, 'The Date of the Death of Herod the Great,' in *Chronos Kairos Christos*, ed. Jerry Vardaman and Edwin Yamauchi (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1989), 101; Donald L. Jones, 'Luke's Interest in Historical Chronology,' in *SBL Seminar Papers 1989* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 378-379.

βασιλέα Ἰουδαίων (*War.* 1.282; cf. *Ant.* 14.381-385).⁹⁹ Writers and inscriptions typically refer to Herod as ‘King of the Jews’ or simply ‘King Herod’ and all of Herod the Great’s coins indicate that this is how the King referred to himself.¹⁰⁰ This makes immediate identification of Luke’s ‘Herod, King of Judaea’ with anyone problematic as Luke 1:5 is the only attestation for this title.¹⁰¹

Luke’s setting Jesus’ birth during a census taken under Quirinius’ governorship over Syria (Luke 2:1-2) further complicates the matter of identifying ‘Herod’ at Luke 1:5.¹⁰² It is generally agreed that Herod the Great died in 4 BCE.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Josephus consistently utilises the latter or simply βασιλέα. Plutarch, *Ant.* 61.1-3; 71.1 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 1: 573–575] twice refers to Herod as Ἰουδαῖος, once as one of the βασιλεῖς who assisted Antony at Actium. At 72.3, Plutarch refers to him as Ἡρώδη τὸν βασιλέα. Interestingly, Appian of Alexandria, *Bella Civilia*, V, 75.318-319 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 188–189] states that Octavian made Herod king over Idumaea and Samaria (not mentioning Judaea). Cassius Dio, *Historiae Romanae*, XLIX, 22.4, 6 [Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 2: 359–360] states that Antony granted Herod to rule (ἄρχειν) the Jews (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι). All the extant coins and inscriptions of Herod refer to him simply as ‘King’. See Meshorer, *Treasury*, 61–62; Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, 2:17; Richardson, *Herod*, 203–209, 213.

¹⁰⁰ Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, 2:17 though one coin may refer to Herod as both King and Tetrarch (see page 86 and n. 110 below). Richardson, *Herod*, 203–209 lists and analyses ten inscriptions. He interprets the Latin stamp *regi herodi iudaico* found on thirteen wine jugs at Masada as ‘King Herod the Jew’, not ‘Herod, King of the Jews’.

¹⁰¹ Below I will also show that Luke creates a sense of tension between ‘Herod’ and Jesus by reserving the title ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων for Jesus in the passion narrative (Luke 23:2, 37-38). See Craig Evans, ‘King Jesus and His Ambassadors: Empire in Luke-Acts,’ in *Empire in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley Porter and Cynthia Long Westfall (Eugene: Pickwick, 2011), 122.

¹⁰² Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 903–909; Evans, *Luke*, 42–44; Marshall, *Luke*, 99–104; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 401–405; Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 2nd ed. (London: Chapman, 1993), 547–555.

¹⁰³ 4 BCE is the accepted date of Herod’s death, though the matter is debated. On the traditional date see Richardson, *Herod*, 296; Timothy D. Barnes, ‘The Date of Herod’s Death,’ *JTS* 19 (1968): 204–209; Hoehner, ‘Date’; Paul Maier, ‘The Date of the Nativity and the Chronology of Jesus’ Life,’ in *Chronos Kairos Christos*, ed. Jerry Vardaman and Edwin Yamauchi (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1989), 116. For alternative dates see Ernest L. Martin, ‘The Nativity and Herod’s Death,’ in *Chronos Kairos Christos*, ed. Jerry Vardaman and Edwin Yamauchi (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1989), 85–92; W. E. Filmer, ‘The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great,’ *JTS* 17 (1966): 283–298; Andrew E. Steinmann, ‘When Did Herod the Great Reign?,’ *NovT* 51 (2009): 1–29. As this thesis focuses on the Herods in the Lukan narrative, Matthew’s birth narrative provides us material with which we may compare and contrast Luke-Acts. Aiding the argument that Luke’s ‘Herod’ is a composite, the author of the third gospel does not narrate Herod the Great’s death like the author of the first gospel does (Matt 2:22).

However, the census of Quirinius occurred in 6 CE.¹⁰⁴ The lapse of ten years between the annunciation of Jesus' birth to Mary and the actual birth of Jesus is obviously problematic. Therefore, several scholars have attempted to remedy this anomaly by proposing that the 'Herod' in view at Luke 1:5 is not Herod the Great, but rather his son, Archelaus, thereby allowing Luke's narrative to be internally consistent (the banishment of Archelaus in 6 CE would account for the mention of Quirinius' governorship and census), but externally (i.e., historically) inconsistent (as it is unlikely that Jesus was born in 6 CE).¹⁰⁵ While numismatic evidence demonstrates that Archelaus did adopt the name 'Herod' upon the death of his father and Matt 2:22 states that he βασιλεύει τῆς Ἰουδαίας, he never technically held the title 'King', though this may have been a popular title for the Ethnarch.¹⁰⁶ Of course, there may be information that remains unknown to us that may provide a better explanation of these historical anomalies.¹⁰⁷ Rather than positing potential archaeological discoveries or assuming Luke's incompetence,¹⁰⁸ a better explanation that allows Luke's narrative to stand on its own is to view the synchronisms of Luke 1:5 and 2:1-2 as bringing together significant people and events with the birth of Christ

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Jos. *Ant.* 18.26. John Lawrence, 'Publius Sulpicius Quirinius and the Syrian Census,' *RestQ* 34 (1992): 193–205; Solomon Zeitlin, 'The Dates of the Birth and Crucifixion of Jesus. The Crucifixion, a Libelous Accusation Against the Jews,' *JQR* 55 (1964): 1–8.

¹⁰⁵ Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 226–227, n. 78; J. Duncan M. Derrett, 'Further Light on the Narratives of the Nativity,' *NovT* 17 (1975): 83–84, 97 both argue that this is the case.

¹⁰⁶ R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 90.

¹⁰⁷ Marshall, *Luke*, 104 cautions that no solution to this issue is possible until more evidence becomes available. Brown, *Birth*, 547–548 discusses alternative explanations. E. Mary Smallwood, *The Jews Under Roman Rule : from Pompey to Diocletian : a Study in Political Relations*, 2nd ed., Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 20 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 568–571 stating that a census under Quirinius before 6 CE is impossible, follows Tertullian who proposes that Luke attached the name of Quirinius to an earlier census that occurred during the rule of Sentius Saturninus over Syria between 9–6 BCE.

¹⁰⁸ Johnson, *Luke*, 49 states plainly that Luke is wrong in relating the birth of Jesus to both the reign of Herod the Great and the census of Quirinius. See also A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 167; Maier, 'Date,' 115.

(presenting a historical chronology with which an ancient reader would be unlikely to have quarrelled) and providing the impetus for Jesus' parents to travel to Bethlehem.¹⁰⁹

Some will contend that Luke utilises different titles alongside the name 'Herod', βασιλεύς (Luke 1:5; Acts 12:1) and τετρααρχέω/τετραάρχης (Luke 3:1; 9:7; Acts 13:1),¹¹⁰ serves to distinguish between the Herods. Scholars sometimes state that Luke has 'corrected' Mark's 'King Herod' (Mark 6:14-29) by referring to Herod (Antipas) as 'Tetrarch'.¹¹¹ This betrays their historical concerns, for which they are not to be slighted; they are correct insofar as they are approaching the text to discuss the historic matters surrounding it. However, we may appeal to historic evidence in order to respond to this objection. While appositional phrases and epithets sometimes help to distinguish between characters,¹¹² this is not necessarily so with the titles 'King' and 'Tetrarch'. We need to turn no further than Mark 6:14-29 and Matthew 14:1-12 to see that the titles 'King' and 'Tetrarch' were interchangeable when referring to the Herods. This appears to have been the case outside the gospels as

¹⁰⁹ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 125; John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary*, The New Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 25, 65; Larry Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003), 269, 342.

¹¹⁰ See Jos. *Ant.* 17.286; Strabo *Geog.* 12.3.1. While the title 'tetrarch' does appear at Luke 3:18; 9:7; Acts 13:1, technically Luke does not use the title at Luke 3:1, but rather the rare verb τετραρχέω. The verb occurs only here in the NT. See also Jos. *War* 2.178; 3.512; 4.82; Life 53; Strabo, *Geog.* 12.5.1; Plutarch, *Mul. Vir.* § 20 for other first-century uses of the verb.

¹¹¹ E.g., John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*, JSNTSS 163 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 140–141; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 348; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 823.

¹¹² See the discussion of appositional phrases appearing with the name Mary in *Pistis Sophia* 1-3 in Ann Graham Brock, *Mary Magdalene, The First Apostle: The Struggle for Authority*, HTS 51 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 92–97.

well,¹¹³ with the two titles often viewed as essentially equal.¹¹⁴ For instance, kings could assume rule over tetrarchies,¹¹⁵ tetrarchies were called kingdoms,¹¹⁶ and tetrarchs sometimes became kings.¹¹⁷ Especially significant in this last regard is Herod the Great's promotion from Tetrarch of Galilee to King of the Jews, for there we see the most famous Herodian ruler having held two titles that are found for 'Herod' in Luke-Acts.¹¹⁸ Further regarding this last point, Meshorer describes a coin of Herod the Great that contains a *tau-rhō* symbol, an L-Gamma indicating the year 'three', and the inscription ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΥ. He notes that scholars have typically understood the *tau-rhō* and the L-Gamma as a double reference to the date (year three of Herod the Great's kingship, ca. 37 BCE). Meshorer reinterprets the *tau-rhō* not as a second reference to the date, but rather an abbreviation of ΤΕΤΡΑΡΧΟΥ, thus rendering the inscriptions and symbols on the coin, 'of King Herod, year three of his tetrarchy'.¹¹⁹

¹¹³ Once again, *pace* Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 140–141 who distinguishes between the titles at Luke 1:5 and 3:1.

¹¹⁴ So Nolland, *Luke 1:1–9:20*, 139. Also Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 457 who states, 'The title "tetrarch" originally designated one who ruled over a fourth part of an area; by the time of the gospel tradition it had become a stereotyped title for a petty prince'. For other contemporary literature see Strabo, *Geog.* 10-12, 5:12.3.1; Plutarch, *Caes.* 50; Plutarch, *Ant.* 36.2; 56.4; 58.5. Not so Plummer, *St. Luke*, 82–83 who cites one instance of a writer differentiating between the two terms, Hor. *Sat.* i.3.12.

¹¹⁵ See Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 280. Kokkinos draws attention to Jos. *Ant.* 18.237; 19.275; cf. Philo, *Philo*, 1985, *Flacc.* 25 where Josephus writes of Agrippa's assumption of both Philip's and Lysanias' tetrarchies and later Jos. *Ant.* 18.252 records his reception of Antipas' tetrarchy; cf. *Ant.* 19.351; *War* 2.181–182, 219.

¹¹⁶ Philo, *Philo*, 1985, *Flacc.* 26.

¹¹⁷ See Strabo, *Geog.* 10-12, 5:12.3.1 where he records Pompey's appointment of the former tetrarch Deiotarus king.

¹¹⁸ Jos. *Ant.* 14.158, 382; *War* 1.203, 282.

¹¹⁹ Meshorer argues this in Meshorer, *Ancient Jewish Coinage*, 2:9–10; Meshorer, *Treasury*, 61–62. His argument is that there would be no reason to mark the date a second time. Also, he states, that Herod would not have waited three years to mint the first coins marking his kingship. So, instead, he proposes that the coins be re-dated to the third year of Herod's tetrarchy, which he received from Antony in 42 BCE, thus making the 'year three' of the coin 40/39 BCE and not overlapping with Herod's kingship. Richardson, *Herod*, 212–213 disagrees, understanding the *tau-rhō* as a reference to the minting authority, either Tyre or some person with the initials TR.

Not only does this historical evidence sufficiently respond to the objection that the titles ‘King’ and ‘Tetrarch’ distinguish the Herods, the narrative of Luke-Acts does as well. Here we may cite the distribution of the titles throughout Luke-Acts, with βασιλεύς appearing with reference to Herod first (Luke 1:5) and at two other points throughout the narrative (Acts 4:27; 12:1)¹²⁰ intermingled with references to Herod τετρααρχέω/τετραάρχης (Luke 3:1; 9:7; Acts 13:1). In light of the discussion above concerning the usage of the titles ‘King’ and ‘Tetrarch’ interchangeably among ancient authors, the juxtaposition of these titles throughout the narrative does not distinguish the Herods within the narrative of Luke-Acts. Rather, it may be construed as Luke’s conflation of the Herods.

The titles ‘King’ and ‘Tetrarch’ are precisely the point at which ‘Herod’ differs from the other names that appear repeatedly in Luke-Acts with various epithets. For instance, the name Judas refers to four different people in Luke-Acts, two of which are given second names, Judas Iscariot (Luke 6:16; 22:3) and Judas Barsabbas (Acts 15:22), thus distinguishing them from one another. Judas, the son of James appears alongside Judas Iscariot in the list of Jesus’ disciples, precluding any confusion of the two (Luke 6:16; cf. Acts 1:13). Judas the Galilean is the fourth Judas, but given the explanation of his rebellion, no conflation takes place (Acts 5:37). Another instance is the name ‘John’, referring to the Baptist (Luke 7:20, 33; 9:19; Acts 1:5) and the son of Zebedee (Luke 5:10). These two epithets, unlike ‘King’ and ‘Tetrarch’, are not interchangeable. Similarly, James the son of Zebedee (Luke 5:10) and James the son of Alphaeus (Luke 6:15) have different fathers and

¹²⁰ My exegesis of Acts 4:24-28 below will demonstrate that Luke understands ‘Herod’ (and Pilate) as representative of *both* the kings and rulers of the Psa 2:1-2 citation.

cannot be conflated. Neither of these two Jameses could be conflated with James the elder (Acts 21:18; cf. 15:13) as it is clear that James the son of Zebedee had died (Acts 12:2) and James the elder does not appear as an apostle in Acts. Another example is the name 'Mary'. The various Marys are distinguished in ways that are not interchangeable: Mary the mother of Jesus (Luke 2:34; Acts 1:14), Mary, the one called Magdalene (Luke 8:2; 24:10), Mary the mother of James (Luke 24:10), and Mary the mother of John Mark (Acts 12:12). The one exception, which has been noted above, is the possible conflation of Mary Magdalene and Mary of Bethany (Luke 10:38-42). Finally, as we have discussed above, Philip the disciple/apostle (Luke 6:14) is distinguished from Philip the evangelist (Acts 6:5; 8:1-40; 21:8) by their appearance together in Acts 6:1-7. Also, there is no way to conflate Philip the Tetrarch (Luke 3:1) with either of these two Philips. We have also discussed the example of Simeon above, which refers to three individuals, and narratively remains somewhat ambiguous at Acts 15:14.

In conjunction with the objection regarding the two titles for 'Herod', some will contend that if these titles do not differentiate between Herods, then the differing geographic specification at Luke 3:1, Ruler of *Galilee*, surely indicates that the 'Herod' of Luke 1:5 no longer reigns as King over Judaea, but that there is another 'Herod' ruling a different region alongside Pilate (who rules Judaea as Governor). Again, this is not as clear as one may think.¹²¹ Barclay notes that both Judaea and

¹²¹ See Bovon, *Luke 1*, 120 on the inexact nature of the geographic designations here. Also Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, Trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), 18–19; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 145, 232; Hugo Gressmann and Erich Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919), 365; Richard J Cassidy, *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1978), 10. As Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 139 states, Luke is not aiming for completeness here.

Galilee would have been viewed as part of Syria by someone outside of Palestine in the Hellenistic and early Imperial periods¹²² and Strabo indicates that the region of Judaea included Galilee.¹²³ This is precisely how Luke depicts matters (Luke 4:14, 44; 7:17; Acts 10:37).¹²⁴ While listing Pilate as governing Judaea and Herod ruling Galilee here may seem to preclude blurring the distinctions between the territories, we should remember that it was likely for Roman and Jewish rulers to work together in governing this part of the ancient world.¹²⁵ In fact, Kokkinos argues that the later Herodians had significant influence during the time of the Roman governors (6-41, 44-65 CE) despite the fact that they did not technically rule over Judaea.¹²⁶ Again, Luke-Acts bears this out as both Herod and Pilate examine Jesus (Luke 23:1-12) and Agrippa and Festus both hear Paul's testimony (Acts 25:23—26:32).

In determining the presence of a composite character in a narrative, two factors must be accounted for: 1) the identity of two or more historic individuals behind the character and 2) the possibility for conflation in the narrative under examination. As for the first factor, though the identity of this particular Herodian

¹²² John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 242.

¹²³ Strabo, *Geog.* 16.2.34. See also BDAG, 478; LN 93.486.

¹²⁴ Carroll, *Luke*, 25.

¹²⁵ As Helen K. Bond, *Pontius Pilate in History and Interpretation*, SNTSMS 100 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 150 notes, all of the rulers named in Luke 3:1-2 have the interest of Rome in mind. In accord with this, we remember that Luke depicts Pilate and 'Herod' as enemies who become friends following their agreement concerning the verdict in the trial of Jesus (Luke 23:12) and portrays 'Herod' conspiring with the Jews and their leaders against Jesus and some of his early followers (Acts 4:25-27; 12:1-3). See David P. Moessner, "'Listening Posts' Along the Way: 'Synchronisms' as Metaleptic Prompts to the 'Continuity of the Narrative' in Polybius' Histories and in Luke's Gospel-Acts. A Tribute to David E. Aune," in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context*, ed. John Fotopoulos, SNT 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 144 who asserts that it is no mistake that Herod and Pilate are named together at Luke 3:1 given, according to Acts 4:25-27, their role in the execution of Jesus.

¹²⁶ Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 308, 317, 319, 322, esp. 359; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 282.

ruler is debated, our inquiry has shown that either Herod the Great or Archelaus is the historic individual behind the text and therefore, not to be identified historically with either Antipas or Agrippa. As for the second factor, we have seen that conflation is not only possible, but likely in the case of Luke's 'Herod' since the titles and the geographic designations employed in the narrative can be shown to be interchangeable both in the Lukan narrative and in the wider world in which Luke wrote. Therefore, the Lukan adaptation that resulted in his introducing 'Herod, King of Judaea' in his narrative lends itself to viewing 'Herod' as a composite.

Herod the King (Acts 12)

The second Lukan adaptation concerning the Herods is a much simpler matter to address. The identification of Herod the King as the historic person Agrippa I is not disputed. Rather, Acts 12 is the only source, literary or epigraphic, that uses the name 'Herod' for Agrippa I.¹²⁷ The use of 'Herod' for Agrippa I in Acts 12, as we have seen above in our review of scholarship, has led scholars to understand Luke's application of this moniker in this instance as a purposeful recalling of the hostility exhibited by Herod (Antipas) toward John the Baptist and Jesus in the third gospel. In the words of Weaver, 'The uniqueness of Luke's use of "Herod" as a name for Agrippa I...is found nowhere else in antiquity, further indicating that the name

¹²⁷ See Allen, Jr., *Death of Herod*, 7, n. 9; Schwartz, *Agrippa I*, 120, n. 50; John B. Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles*, BZNTW 131 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 210; Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom, *The Roman Empire in Luke's Narrative*, LNTS 404 (London: T & T Clark, 2010), 196; Richard I. Pervo, *Acts, Hermeneia* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 303; Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts, Paideia* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 172; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles I-XIV*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 573. Grant, *Herod*, 12 writes, 'After Matthew's narration of the Massacre of the Innocents, the New Testament writers continue to pose problems for his biographers by choosing to employ the bare name of "Herod" for three different men, one of whom was not, in fact, called Herod at all.'

derives primarily from the literary purposes and patterns of Luke-Acts'.¹²⁸ Weaver continues, stating that this clear adaptation by Luke 'encourages the reader to equate the two Herods' (i.e., Herod the Tetrarch and Herod the King).¹²⁹ I want to go one step beyond Weaver, arguing that the appearance of the name 'Herod' at this point not only recalls the other Herod of the third gospel, but is a key factor in Luke's construction of a composite 'Herod'.

Luke's Composite 'Herod'

We have now addressed the two distinctive features in the portrayal of the Herods in Luke-Acts which point toward my construal of composite 'Herod'. When we compare and contrast Luke-Acts with what is known about the Herodian rulers in other extant sources we see that Luke's use of the title 'King of Judaea' at Luke 1:5 and the name 'Herod' for Agrippa I in Acts 12 are unique. While a degree of family resemblance is to be expected – all of the Herods after Herod the Great ruled in such a way as to pattern their reigns after the patriarch and some even adopted his name upon their succession¹³⁰ – it is precisely this resemblance that helps make narrative conflation possible. The respective reigns of Herod and his descendants over parts of the Eastern Mediterranean were quite similar in various respects (e.g., the desire for

¹²⁸ Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, 210.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 210, n. 167.

¹³⁰ On 'Herod' as a dynastic name, see Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 226-227, n. 78. I find the assumption that 'Herod' was a dynastic name unpersuasive given the fact that several of Herod the Great's descendants (including two of his children, see Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 525) were given this name, others adopted it (e.g., Archelaus and Antipas), and others did *not* adopt it (e.g., Agrippa I and Agrippa II). In the cases of Archelaus and Antipas, we may account for their adoption the moniker as attempts to legitimise their reigns in the eyes of their subjects and of Rome, or simply as further patterning their rules after their father.

Imperial favour, building cities, maintaining the appearance of respect for Jewish scruples, tyrannical behaviour, etc.). Given this similarity, it is not surprising to see them aligned narratively.¹³¹ However, what we find in Luke-Acts with the title ‘King of Judaea’ at Luke 1:5 and the name ‘Herod’ for Agrippa I in Acts 12 are distinctive, unique features that, in light of the entire narrative portrayal of the Herods in Luke-Acts, can be interpreted as a composite character, ‘Herod’. It is indeed remarkable that these distinctive features find *no* attestation outside of Luke-Acts – nothing in Josephus,¹³² no corroboration from another ancient literary witness, no inscriptions, no numismatic evidence. Surely, if Herod the Great or Archelaus held the title ‘King of Judaea’ it would appear on a coin or be attested by Josephus. This does not occur. It is telling that Josephus does not refer to Agrippa I as ‘Herod’ given his desire to align the two kings narratively in *Antiquities*. Even more telling, if ‘Herod’ was in fact a dynastic name, is the lack of evidence that Agrippa ever used this name for himself given Archelaus’ and Antipas’ adoption of the name as recorded by their coins and Josephus’ record. We must account for these anomalies. The argument of this thesis is that these unique features in Luke’s narrative point may be understood as conflation of the Herods. In this way, the recurrence of the name ‘Herod’ in light of these distinctive features result in composite ‘Herod’. We will now proceed to the text of Luke-Acts itself to demonstrate Luke’s consistent depiction of ‘Herod’ throughout the narrative.

¹³¹ See above on the alignment of Agrippa I with Herod the Great in Josephus’ *Antiquities*.

¹³² I have noted the promise of Cassius to Herod to make him King of Judaea at Jos. *Ant.* 14.280, but also that Herod never actually held that specific title.

Chapter 5: A King and Ruler Takes His Stand:

Composite ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts

“‘King Herod’ had to be an enemy of the Christians!’¹

This chapter will examine all but two passages in Luke-Acts in which ‘Herod’ appears in accordance with the methodology outlined above.² The previous chapter showed two distinctive features in the portrayal of the Herods in Luke-Acts which lend themselves to understanding the three Herods who are called ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts as a composite character. The purpose of this chapter will be to thoroughly explore the consistent depiction of ‘Herod’ as a character in Luke-Acts. I will proceed by treating every occurrence of the name ‘Herod’ as a reference to a single character, agreeing with Docherty who writes that the first appearance of a name in a narrative acts as a *blanc sémantique* which is subsequently filled with meaning.³ I will begin with Acts 4:25-27 which, as I will show, is a programmatic statement about composite ‘Herod’. This passage functions analeptically, recalling ‘Herod’s’ hostility not only toward Jesus in the third gospel, but also that faced by

¹ Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 381, n. 1.

² We will examine the characterisation of ‘Herod’ in Acts 12:20-23 and Acts 23:35 in the next chapter as these passages relate to the themes discussed there.

³ Thomas Docherty, *Reading (Absent) Character: Towards a Theory of Characterization in Fiction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 47. Though Docherty’s approach is reader-oriented and deals with fiction, his description of the use of names in narratives applies here as we are examining the recurrence of a proper name in a literary work. John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*, JSNTSS 163 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 140 follows Docherty to an extent, but distinguishes between the Herods of Luke 1:5 and 3:1 by appealing to the different titles used in conjunction with the name. We have addressed this matter above and will be approaching the titles ‘King’ and ‘Tetrarch/Ruler’ as if they are interchangeable.

John the Baptist. This is accomplished by examining features of the characterisation of both characters that cast them similarly. Acts 4:25-27 also serves a proleptic purpose, anticipating 'Herod's' persecution of the Jerusalem church, especially two of its key leaders (Acts 12:1-6). Following the analysis of Acts 4:25-27, I will begin with Luke 1:5 as that passage introduces 'Herod' into the narrative and sets this character up as a rival to Jesus and potential opponent of John the Baptist. Then, I will examine Luke's characterisation of 'Herod' in relation to both of these protagonists of Luke's gospel as well as the portrayal of 'Herod' over against the apostles and early Christians in Acts. What will emerge is a picture of composite 'Herod' that displays the consistency expected of characters in Hellenistic literature, a consistency centred on this character's antagonism toward Luke's protagonists, evidenced in actions that seek to eliminate the leaders of the nascent Jesus movement.⁴

Acts 4:25-27: A Programmatic Statement About 'Herod'

The story found in Acts 4:23-31 is not only integral to the narrative of Luke-Acts,⁵ but also contains the central reflection regarding the role of 'Herod' in those

⁴ The specific nature of 'Herod's' opposition toward the protagonists of Luke-Acts, namely the king's hindrance of the proclamation of the gospel, is the topic of the next chapter below.

⁵ Geir Otto Holmas, *Prayer and Vindication in Luke-Acts*, LNTS 433 (London: T & T Clark, 2011), 179 states, 'The prayer recounted in 4.24b-30 is essential and integral to the developing story'. Also see Urban C. von Wahlde, 'Acts 4,24-31: The Prayer of the Apostles in Response to the Persecution of Peter and John - and Its Consequences,' *Bib* 77 (1996): 238; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 197.

works.⁶ In the narrative of Luke-Acts, the antagonism of ‘Herod’ is one of several links between the protagonists.⁷ In Acts 4:25-27, ‘Herod’ is named in a story in which he has played no part. However, this naming interprets opposition toward the apostles in Acts in light of Jesus’ passion. Furthermore, ‘Herod’ in this context recalls the role that the ruler plays throughout the entire narrative, opposing not only Jesus but also John the Baptist as well as the apostles and early church. This passage also provides us with an impetus internal to Luke-Acts for understanding ‘Herod’ as a composite as Luke carefully structures his citation and interpretation of Psa 2:1-2 (LXX) so as to describe ‘Herod’ as a representative king and ruler. The composite character emerges as we see that ‘Herod’ is the only character in the narrative who is both ‘king’ and ‘ruler’.

⁶ The role of programmatic passages in Luke-Acts has been well-documented. On Acts 4:27 as a key passage and Herod’s role as a Roman ruler in Luke-Acts see Steve Walton, ‘The State They Were In: Luke’s View of the Roman Empire,’ in *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002), 19; Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*, Theology of the New Testament (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 101. On other programmatic passages see e.g., Luke T. Johnson, *Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 16; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 21. The two most noted programmatic passages are Jesus’ disclosure of his vocation in Luke 4:16-21 and the geographic references in Acts 1:8. On Luke 4:16-30 see e.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, AB 28 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), 529 who states, ‘The Lucan story, transposed to this point in the Gospel, has a definite programmatic character’. Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 207 views Luke 4:16-30 as ‘of central importance for the narrative as a whole’. See also Patrick E. Spencer, *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories of the Lukan Galilean Ministry Speeches: Hermeneutical Appropriation by Authorial Readers of Luke-Acts*, LNTS 341 (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 6. Luke T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, SP 5 (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 12 who lists Acts 1:8 as an ‘obvious example’ among other ‘programmatic prophecies’ in Acts 3:22; 11:27; 13:46-47; 19:21; 20:25; 21:11; 23:11; 27:22; 28:28. Richard I. Pervo, *Acts*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 43 likens Acts 1:8 to an ‘introductory oracle’ similar to those found in other ancient narratives. Haenchen, *Acts*, 144–146 concludes that Luke has laid out the content of Acts in 1:8 through the words of Jesus. Acts 4:25b-28, though perhaps not as significant as these two passages, nevertheless works in much the same way with regard to ‘Herod’s’ role in the narrative.

⁷ Other links include the antagonism of the Jerusalem leaders, Pilate, and other Roman governors.

The context of the passage under consideration recounts the first opposition faced by the apostles in the Book of Acts (Acts 3:1—4:31).⁸ Peter healing a lame man at the Temple (Acts 3:1-10) and addressing the crowd that had gathered after recognising that the lame man was healed (Acts 3:11-26) prompt the opposition from the Jewish leadership. Upon learning of the commotion in the Temple, several groups of Jerusalem leaders came together to arrest both Peter and John, placing the apostles in custody until they were able to interrogate them the next day (Acts 4:1-3). Following the interrogation the Jerusalem leaders were unable to find any reason to punish the apostles, so they released Peter and John with explicit orders to speak in the name of Jesus no longer (Acts 4:5-22). Peter and John returned to the other believers and reported what the Jewish leaders had told them (Acts 4:23).⁹ Those with Peter and John offer a prayer together for boldness in which they correlate the threats of the Temple elite with Jesus' passion (Acts 4:24-31).

The prayer of the community interests us here, specifically Acts 4:25b-27, a section that brings the passion of Jesus and the persecution of the early church together in a single text and names those who have been and will be responsible for

⁸ Holmas, *Prayer and Vindication*, 180. C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles I-XIV*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 241 rightly sees Acts 4:23-31 as the focal point of 3:1--5:42.

⁹ Τοὺς ἰδίους (4:23) refers to the Jerusalem church (or some segment of it) and not exclusively to the other apostles. See Pervo, *Acts*, 121–122; Holmas, *Prayer and Vindication*, 183–184; Rudolph Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte (Apg 1-12)*, EKK 5.1 (Köln: Neukirchener, 1986), 175; Beverley Roberts Gaventa, *Acts*, ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003), 94-95; Haenchen, *Acts*, 226; Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 241–243; Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts*, Paideia (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 66; F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Third Revised and Enlarged Ed. (Leicester: Apollos, 1990), 156; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, AB 31 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 306; Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 184; Didier Rimaud, 'La Première Prière Liturgique,' *La Maison Dieu* 51 (1957): 100. *Contra* Johnson, *Acts*, 83; Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 201; von Wahlde, 'Acts 4,24-31,' 237; Jacques Dupont, 'Notes sur les Actes des Apôtres,' *RevBib* 62 (1955): 45–46.

both: ‘Herod’, Pilate, the nations/Gentiles, and the people of Israel. This list of individuals and groups – when the context clearly indicates that opposition arose from the Jerusalem leaders – is both striking and puzzling. However, our analysis of the citation and interpretation of Psa 2:1-2 will demonstrate that opposition faced by the early church is an extension of the opposition faced by Jesus in the Lukan narrative.¹⁰ We will then briefly investigate the naming of ‘Herod’ and Pilate in 4:27 with reference to Psa 2:1-2, showing that these are characters who are representative kings and rulers to whom the psalm refers. The characterisation of ‘Herod’ as a king and ruler in opposition to Jesus in this text encapsulates the characterisation of ‘Herod’ throughout the entire narrative of Luke-Acts.

Psalm 2:1-2: Correlating Jesus’ Passion with Opposition toward the Church

In Acts 4:24-31, the response of the early church to Peter and John’s report of opposition is a prayer¹¹ addressed to the creator God in which they quote Psa 2:1-2 (LXX).¹² In its original context this psalm is a coronation psalm that depicts the

¹⁰ Psa 2:1-2 is easily understood with reference to Jesus’ passion. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1952), 105. This citation coincides with the Lukan emphasis on the Scriptures being fulfilled in the events of Jesus’ life and work, especially his death (Luke 4:21; 22:37; 24:27, 44-47; Acts 3:18; 8:32-35; 13:27, 33).

¹¹ Many commentators see Isa 37:16-20 as the inspiration for this prayer, e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 226; Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 245; Pervo, *Acts*, 121; Gaventa, *Acts*, 95; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 2nd ed., Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 34. P. T. O’Brien, ‘Prayer in Luke-Acts,’ *Tyndale Bulletin* 24 (1973): 123; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 306–307 note the parallel to *Ant.* 4.40-50 where Josephus records an earthquake as a result of Moses’ prayer. Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 185 sees parallels to Neh 9:6 and Psa 146:6. Robert L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 100 believes the prayer corresponds to the plot of Psa 117 (LXX) which calls the readers to acknowledge God’s goodness and mercy. Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 204–205 prefers to see this text not as dependent on earlier Jewish traditions but as an original theological reflection of the early Christian community.

¹² The text of the formula used to introduce the psalm (4:25) is syntactically difficult. This verse is, as Gaventa, *Acts*, 95 notes, a ‘syntactical nightmare’. Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 2002), 279–281 lays out the options

rebellion of Gentile kings and rulers against the Lord's anointed king.¹³ This meaning of the psalm bears on the present situation as the explanation (γάρ) of the psalm applies its theme directly to Jesus' passion (4:27).¹⁴ The repetition of several key words from the psalm in the explanation given in 4:27-28 (ἔθνος [4:25, 27], λαός [4:25, 27], συνήχθησαν [4:26-27], the cognate terms χριστός and χρίω [4:26-27]) reinforces the application of the psalm and couples it with the reference to 'Herod's' involvement in the gathering against Jesus, a feature unique to the Lukan version of Jesus' passion (cf. Luke 23:6-12).¹⁵ In other words, in Luke-Acts, Jesus is the Lord's anointed king. The kings of the earth, rulers, nations, and peoples of Israel gathered

for understanding the issues of textual transmission. H. W. Moule, 'Acts iv.25,' *ExpT* 51 (1940): 396 suggests that the original author made corrections to a draft of the book and a copyist who did not understand the editorial notations of the author simply combined them with the result being the text that now appears in NA²⁸. This is creative, but not demonstrable. Urban C. von Wahlde, 'The Problems of Acts 4:25a: A New Proposal,' *ZNW* 86 (1995): 265–267 proposes that the text (as it stands in NA²⁷) may be explained by means of a chiasmic structure. Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation From Prophecy and Pattern*, JSNTSS 12 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 202–203 believes that elements have been added, dropped out or rearranged due to copyist error(s) to produce the text as it stands. Conceding that we are unable to reconstruct the original are Bruce, *Acts*, 156–157; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 185, 189. We agree with Bock, *Acts*, 205 who states that the basic idea is clear even if the syntax is not: David served as the mouthpiece for the Holy Spirit. The formula is a relative clause that may be translated, 'who spoke by the mouth of our father David, your servant, through the Holy Spirit...'

¹³ Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 186; Peter Doble, 'The Psalms in Luke-Acts,' in *The Psalms in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken (London: Continuum, 2004), 102; Konrad Schaefer, *Psalms*, Berit Olam (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2001), 8; Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms I: 1-50*, AB 16 (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 7. Jamie Grant, 'Singing the Cover Versions,' *SBEvT* 25 (2007): 40–41 notes that the theme of rejection is continued from the quotation of Psalms 118:22 earlier in the story (Acts 4:11).

¹⁴ Heike Omerzu, 'Das Traditionsgeschichtliche Verhältnis der Begegnungen von Jesus mit Herodes Antipas und Paulus mit Agrippa II,' *SNTSU* 28 (2003): 132; Bock, *Acts*, 205; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 186.

¹⁵ Bock, *Proclamation*, 205; Gaventa, *Acts*, 96.

against Jesus in the city of Jerusalem according to ἡ χεὶρ¹⁶ and ἡ βουλή προώρισεν of God.¹⁷

The setting of this psalm and his explanation of it in this prayer correlates the opposition experienced by the apostles and the entire Christian community in Jerusalem with Jesus' passion (Acts 4:29-30). As Tannehill states, 'This recall of Jesus' passion is relevant because Jesus' situation, threatened by rulers and peoples, is viewed as essentially the same as the church's situation, faced with the threats of the Sanhedrin.'¹⁸ Similarly, Bock writes, 'The point of the Psalm is to proclaim the community's understanding and confidence that the problems which they face are an extension of the opposition to the Christ Jesus...', and continues by stating that the role of the church is 'a role parallel to their Messiah, that is as an object of opposition and persecution.'¹⁹ Weaver sums this point up well, stating that Acts 4:24-31 'is among the most explicit [passages] paralleling of the life of Jesus and the apostles in

¹⁶ ἡ χεὶρ, in this context, refers to the power of God (cf. 4:30) that supersedes the power of the authorities opposing the apostles (4:3). So Haenchen, *Acts*, 227; Bock, *Acts*, 208; Grant, 'Cover Versions,' 40.

¹⁷ See Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 186 who points out that the psalm is applied directly to the Messianic king by Luke. An emphasis on Jesus' kingship and opposition from 'Herod' the king in the Lukan narrative will be important as we explore Luke's characterisation of 'Herod' at Luke 1:5.

¹⁸ Robert C. Tannehill, 'The Composition of Acts 3-5: Narrative Development and Echo Effect,' in *SBL Seminar Papers 1984* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984), 235.

¹⁹ Bock, *Proclamation*, 206. Also see Haenchen, *Acts*, 227; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 186; Pervo, *Acts*, 122-123; Bock, *Acts*, 206; Holmas, *Prayer and Vindication*, 182; Robert L. Gallagher, 'From "Doingness" to "Beingness": A Missiological Interpretation,' in *Mission in Acts*, ed. Robert L. Gallagher and Paul Hertig (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2004), 49; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1990), 63, 68-72; Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 206. Darr does, however, go too far in attempting to draw parallels between Jesus and the church when he claims that the church is the Lord's anointed in this case. Though the church has received the Spirit at Pentecost, only Jesus is the Lord's anointed in the Lukan narratives (Luke 4:18; Acts 10:38). Urban C. von Wahlde, 'The Theological Assessment of the First Christian Persecution: The Apostles' Prayer and Its Consequences in Acts 4,24-31,' *Bib* 76 (1995): 527; Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New Testament*, T&T Clark Approaches to Biblical Studies (London: Continuum, 2001), 54; Jacques Dupont, 'L'interprétation des Psaumes,' in *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1967), 298; Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, Rev. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 158 all cite the Qumran community's application of Psalms 2:1-2 to opposition they faced in 4QFlor 1.18-19 as a similar contemporary example.

Acts'.²⁰ This may seem like an extreme move given that the apostles were only detained and threatened whereas Jesus was mocked, beaten, and wrongly crucified, but it is the first instance of opposition to the church (however slight) in Acts and more intense forms of opposition and persecution follow in the narrative.²¹

The conclusion of the scene is the assembled church uttering this prayer in response to the apostles' report of the threats from the Jerusalem leaders (4:23-24); the church concludes with a request for boldness in their continued preaching and miracle-working, the exact activities which brought on the threats (4:29-30; cf. 3:1—4:22). The narrative effect of this prayer is a casting of the early Christian community in continuity with Jesus' life and work and just like Jesus they will face opposition from different political and religious authorities as well as people in general.²² The natural question is, who are these authorities and what is the nature of their opposition to Jesus and the church?

²⁰ John B. Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles*, BZNTW 131 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 129, n. 132. Cf. also Acts 9:4-5 where Saul's persecution of the church is equated with persecution of Jesus.

²¹ As Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, Rev. ed., Reading the New Testament (Macon: Smyth & Helwys Publishers, 2005), 46; Tannehill, 'Composition,' 218; Witherington III, *Acts*, 199 note, the Jerusalem church faces ever increasing levels of persecution culminating in the death of Stephen. We note also Saul's persecution of the church and the death of James in Acts 12:1.

²² Dupont, 'L'interprétation,' 299. In Acts 1:1 Luke writes that his former book recorded ὃν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, thus giving the impression that the second book will record the continued activity and teaching of Jesus. After the ascension, the only way to understand this is to view the activities and teaching of the apostles and early Christian communities in Acts as the continued work of Jesus. This passage reflects one aspect of that reality. On this interpretation of Acts 1:1, see Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 66-67; Bruce, *Acts*, 98; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 195. As C. Kevin Rowe, *World Upside Down* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 153 writes, '...the main characters in Acts, to put it plainly, look like Jesus...'

Those Who Gather in Opposition: Kings, Rulers, Nations, Peoples

We see further correlation of the hostility faced by the early Christians with that faced by Jesus in his passion as narrated in the third gospel with the appearance of some of the same Jewish leaders in opposition to the apostles/church. Acts 4:1, 5-6 specifically points out those who seek to put an end to the apostolic preaching in this story: οἱ ἱερεῖς, ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι, τοὺς ἄρχοντας, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, τοὺς γραμματεῖς, Ἄννας ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, Καϊάφας, Ἰωάννης, and Ἀλέξανδρος. Οἱ ἄρχων, referring to the Jewish leaders, are the ones who come against both Jesus and the apostles (Luke 24:20; Acts 4:5, 26, 29).²³ John and Alexander do not appear elsewhere in the Lukan narrative. With the exception of οἱ ἱερεῖς²⁴ these groups and individuals often appear in contexts which portray them as hostile toward Jesus in Luke's gospel and Christians in Acts.²⁵ Luke 9:22 and 24:20 are particularly significant in this regard. The former is the first passion prediction in the Lukan narrative, implicating the elders, scribes, and chief priests in Jesus' death. The latter text is part of the Emmaus road episode and represents the first reflection on Jesus' passion in which he implicates the chief priests and rulers in Jesus' death.²⁶ Pervo also draws attention to Luke 22:66 which indicates that the elders and chief priests gather together (συνάγω) in order to interrogate Jesus.²⁷ At Acts 4:5, 26-27

²³ Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 186.

²⁴ Cf. Acts 6:7 where many priests become obedient to the faith.

²⁵ Luke 9:22; 20:1, 19, 46; 22:2, 4, 52; 23:13, 35; 24:20; Acts 5:17, 24, 26; 6:12; 7:1; 9:1; 13:27; 14:5; 23:5, 14; 24:1; 25:15. So Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 297–298.

²⁶ Johnson, *Luke*, 151; Michael Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 345.

²⁷ Pervo, *Acts*, 115, n. 2.

this word (συνήχθησαν), which explicitly connotes hostility, is repeated.²⁸ The recurrence of οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς and οἱ πρεσβύτεροι at 4:5-6, 23 draws specific attention to these particular Jewish leaders, especially Annas and Caiaphas, the high priests who appear only here and Luke 3:2 by name.²⁹ I agree with Tannehill who suggests,

The opponents of Jesus and of the church are viewed as one continuous group, a simplification which is facilitated by the fact that the Sanhedrin had a leading role in both situations....³⁰

Also, as with Jesus in the Lukan passion narrative, the church is in Jerusalem (ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, Acts 4:27) and in both cases no reason to punish the supposed offending party is found (Luke 23:4, 14; Acts 4:21).³¹ Thus, this context portrays the early church as an extension of Jesus, particularly with regard to the opposition toward Peter's preaching, by naming several of Jesus' specific opponents and casting them as opponents of the apostles and early church.

‘Herod’ as King and Ruler: Luke’s Interpretation of Psa 2:1-2

The clearest indication that the opposition faced by the church is a continuation of the antagonism Jesus faced is the citation and interpretation of Psa

²⁸ Ibid., 115, n. 2; Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 206; BDAG, 962; LSJ, 1691. Elsewhere in Luke-Acts συνάγω refers either to gathering crops (Luke 3:17; 11:23, both of which are metaphorical) or a Christian gathering (Acts 4:31; 11:26; 13:44; 14:27; 15:6, 30; 20:7-8).

²⁹ Scott Cunningham, *Through Many Tribulations: The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSS 142 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 189. Haenchen, *Acts*, 226–227 sees only a generic reference to the Jewish leaders of 4:1, 5-6. However, the chief priests and elders are the key groups throughout Luke-Acts that oppose Jesus and the early church (cf. Luke 9:22; 20:1; 22:52; 24:20; Acts 6:12; 7:1; 24:1; 25:15).

³⁰ Tannehill, ‘Composition,’ 235.

³¹ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 207. In Luke’s passion narrative the Jerusalem leaders do believe they have reason to have Jesus condemned (Luke 22:71) and though Pilate believed Jesus was innocent, he sought to beat Jesus and finally succumbed to the pressure of the crowd and sentenced Jesus to death anyway.

2:1-2 (LXX), which appears in the Jerusalem church's prayer, thus depicting the early Christians as correlating their experience with that of Jesus. The anomaly is the inclusion of 'Herod' and Pilate in his explanation of the psalm instead of other more likely ἄρχοντες (Acts 4:26) as the antecedent of αὐτῶν (Acts 4:29; cf. 4:5).³² Several scholars have explained this anomaly by suggesting that a source containing a Palestinian tradition lies behind Luke's naming these two rulers.³³ This is, of course, impossible to demonstrate. Some have suggested that Herod and Pilate's friendship in the wake of Jesus' trial provides the impetus for their inclusion here.³⁴ If correlation of the opposition of the early church and Jesus' passion is the goal of the narrative and if the Jewish religious leaders play a key role in both stories, then these explanations are insufficient to explain why 'Herod' and Pilate appear *in this particular context* when there are other seemingly more suitable alternatives.

As a solution to this anomaly, I suggest that the consistent hostility of 'Herod' toward several of Luke's protagonists is the reason for 'Herod's' appearance here.³⁵ As we have seen above, Acts 4 recalls Jesus' passion. In addition, the appearance of Annas, Caiaphas, Pilate, and 'Herod' in this context recalls 'Herod's' hostility toward John the Baptist by looking back to Luke 3:1-2.³⁶ Further, associating the experiences of the Jerusalem church with 'Herod's' hostility toward both Jesus and John also recalls the reign of 'Herod' as the backdrop for the stories

³² Gaventa, *Acts*, 97.

³³ Martin Dibelius, 'Herodes und Pilatus,' *ZNW* 16 (1915): 113–126; Pervo, *Acts*, 120; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 307.

³⁴ Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (London: Nicholson and Watson, 1934), 199; Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 247; Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 206.

³⁵ Pilate is closely aligned with 'Herod' throughout the narrative (Luke 3:1; 23:1-15).

³⁶ We will see that of all the political figures named in Luke 3:1-2, 'Herod' emerges in Luke 3:18-20 to imprison and subsequently behead John the Baptist (Luke 9:9).

of John and Jesus' births (Luke 1:5). The naming of 'Herod' here not only serves this analeptic purpose, but also a proleptic one. Without doubt, the Jerusalem elite appear throughout the narrative of Acts seeking to thwart the church's mission. However, 'Herod' also appears once more, actively persecuting the church (Acts 12:1-6). In this way, we may think of Acts 4:25-27 as the programmatic depiction of 'Herod' as this character appears in a context that ties 'Herod's' antagonism toward the protagonists together.³⁷

To say this immediately reminds us of the argument of this thesis: that 'Herod' is a composite character. Acts 4:25-27 demonstrates this as it links 'Herod's' opposition toward John, Jesus, and the early church, thus giving us one reason to understand the various Herods as 'Herod'. Additionally, the structure of the explanation of Psa 2:1-2 provides a second reason to view 'Herod' as a composite, namely that 'Herod' and Pontius Pilate stand together as representatives of the kings and rulers of the psalm. The exegetical analysis of Acts 4:25-27 that follows will demonstrate this.

We begin with the citation of Psa 2:1-2 (LXX), noting that the two sets of two lines in the citation reflect synonymous parallelism. These lines state in general terms that Gentile people rage and plot in vain³⁸ against the Lord and his anointed

³⁷ As for the appearance of Pilate here, we remember that he is listed alongside the other political rulers at Luke 3:1-2, appears later in the narrative as a murderer (Luke 13:1), and succumbs to pressure to order Jesus' execution (Luke 23:1-25; Acts 3:13; 13:28). Certainly an unflattering portrait of Pilate emerges in the Lukan writings, but the negative impact of that portrait is softened by the predominate assessment of Pilate as having come under the influence of the Jewish religious leaders. Pilate takes his place among the enemies of the Lord and the Messiah here in Acts 4 because he bears ultimate *political* responsibility for the death of Jesus in Luke-Acts.

³⁸ Φρυάσσω is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT and also at Psa 1:1 in the LXX, though φρυάττομαι appears at 2 Macc 7:34; 3 Macc 2:2. In all four instances the term is used metaphorically to connote insolence, vanity, or arrogance. See LSJ, 1958; BDAG, 1067; Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 246; Bruce, *Acts*, 157; Johnson, *Acts*, 84. Μελετάω is *hapax* in Luke-Acts, occurs only at 1 Tim 4:15 elsewhere in the NT where the author commands the recipient to put into practice several instructions. In the LXX the

king and ‘the kings of the earth’ and ‘the rulers’ stand against the Lord and his messiah.³⁹ The psalm writer’s use of synonymous parallelism indicates that each of these two sets of two should be understood as different ways of referring to the same hypothetical opponents. The climax of Psa 2:1-2 is the gathering of all of these hostile entities against the Lord and his Messiah. This results in the following structure:

A – ἵνατί ἐφρύαξαν ἔθνη καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν κενά;

B – παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες

C – συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.

The verbatim citation of the LXX points to the maintenance of this parallelism and structure of the psalm citation as Weren states, ‘In as far as the translation from Hebrew into Greek permits, the majority of the unifying elements in the LXX have been maintained. This even applies to the parallelism and the chiastic word order’.⁴⁰ Maintenance of this parallelism is evident in the interpretation of the psalm which reflects its structure (Acts 4:27).⁴¹ The verb συνήχθησαν defines the action of all four of the entities in the explanation.⁴² We also see repetition of the terms ἔθνη (ἔθνεσιν)

term refers either to meditation and discernment (e.g., Josh 1:8; Psa 62:7; 70:6, 13; 119:16; Prov 15:28; Job 6:30; Isa 33:18; Sir 6:37; 14:20), to do or say something (e.g. Psa 1:2; 34:28; 36:30; Prov 8:7; Job 27:4) or to care for or attend to something (e.g. Psa 70:24). On these senses, see LSJ, 1096; BDAG, 627. In a few Septuagintal references (Prov 24:2; Isa 53:3, 13), the sense is to speak against someone or God, which is likely the sense in Psa 2 and Acts 4. See Johnson, *Acts*, 84.

³⁹ The LXX translators of the psalms generally follow the underlying Hebrew text as far as we can know it very closely. See Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 19; Natalio Fernandez Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 326. Psa 2:1-2 appears to be a clear example of a word-for-word representation of the underlying Hebrew. See Pesch, *Apg 1-12*, 176.

⁴⁰ Wim Weren, ‘Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts: An Intertextual Study,’ in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*, ed. Sipke Draisma (Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok, 1989), 195.

⁴¹ Omerzu, ‘Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,’ 132, n. 44 claims that Luke’s interpretation does not maintain the parallelism of the psalm.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 132.

and λαοί (λαοῖς), mirroring the parallelism of the first line of the psalm. However, οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες specifies to whom the parallel terms refer, ‘Herod’ and Pontius Pilate, the two key political figures in the Lukan passion narrative. At this point it is important to remember that ἔθνη/λαοί and οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς/οἱ ἄρχοντες each represent poetically synonymous, hostile groups. This parallelism means that nations may be equated with people (and *vice versa*) and kings may be equated with rulers (and *vice versa*). An analysis of the interpretation of the psalm must maintain this parallelism:⁴³

A – ἵνατί ἐφρύαξαν ἔθνη καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν κενά;

B – παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες

C – συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.

C’ – συνήχθησαν γὰρ ἐπ’ ἀληθείας ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου
Ἰησοῦν ὃν ἔχρισας,

B’ – Ἡρώδης τε καὶ Πόντιος Πιλάτος

A’ – σὺν ἔθνεσιν καὶ λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ⁴⁴

This means we should not seek one-to-one correlation or identification between terms as Haenchen proposes (with many scholars following him): that Herod = kings, Pilate = rulers, nations = soldiers at the crucifixion or Roman authorities in general, people of Israel = Jews.⁴⁵ ‘Herod’ is not to be directly identified only as ‘king’ or

⁴³ Weren, ‘Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts,’ 195; von Wahlde, ‘Assessment,’ 528.

⁴⁴ Weren, ‘Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts,’ 197; Brawley, *Text to Text*, 102 each understand the structure of the passage in this way, though they do not maintain as I will that ‘Herod’ and Pilate are representative kings and rulers.

⁴⁵ Haenchen, *Acts*, 227. Others follow this scheme, including Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 309–310; Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 206; Witherington III, *Acts*, 202; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 186; Dibelius, ‘Herodes und Pilatus,’ 124; Gaventa, *Acts*, 96; Martin Rese, ‘Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas’ (Doktorwürde, Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1965), 138–139; Marion L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994), 49. Bruce, *Acts*, 158–159 believes that ‘nations’ refers to Roman authorities in general. E. Jane Via, ‘According to Luke, Who Put Jesus to Death?’, in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, ed. Richard J. Cassidy and Philip Scharper (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983), 132, 135 rightly indicates that ‘rulers’ refers to the entire group of those involved in Jesus’ trial and death at Luke 23:13, 36 and

‘ruler’ and Pilate as either ‘ruler’ *or* ‘king’. Rather, ‘Herod’ and Pilate are together representative kings/rulers. Likewise, the nations and people of Israel are representative of the nations and people who plot and rage against the Lord and his anointed king.⁴⁶ This most adequately accounts for the parallelism of the psalm and mirroring it in the interpretation. This is evident if we simplify our chiasm to highlight the parallel terms:

A – ἐφρύαξαν ἔθνη καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν

B – παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες

C – συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.

C′ – συνήχθησαν γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου Ἰησοῦν ὃν ἔχρισας,

B′ – Ἡρώδης τε καὶ Πόντιος Πιλάτος

A′ – σὺν ἔθνεσιν καὶ λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ

Two grammatical points support this interpretation. First, we note the addition of τε in B′, creating a construction which indicates a closer connection between ‘Herod’ and Pilate than καὶ alone.⁴⁷ Second, the verb συνήχθησαν describes the action of

that at Acts 4:26-27 Herod and Pilate come within the purview of rulers, but finally states that the rulers of Acts 4:26 refers to the Jewish rulers earlier in the narrative. Oddly, Omerzu, ‘Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,’ 132 follows Haenchen, but also states (n. 44) that the Gentiles and people of Israel form a single group and that kings and rulers form another. However, as I point out, the explanation of the psalm places Herod and Pilate among the ‘rulers’ mentioned in the psalm as well. There is undoubtedly overlap among the referents of these terms.

⁴⁶ We agree with Weren, ‘Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts,’ 197 on these two points. However, Weren continues by distinguishing between Herod the Tetrarch on the one hand and Herod the Great and Agrippa I as kings on the other. Though we agree with Brawley, *Text to Text*, 102 on the structure of the chiasm above, we disagree with his assertion that Luke’s interpretation of the psalm disregards the synonymous parallelism of the psalm. As noted above, ἄρχων refers also to the Jewish leaders; they were ‘rulers’ after all. However, the non-mention of them in the interpretation of Psalms 2:1-2 and the inclusion of Herod and Pilate at 4:27 points to a wider referent to this term. Ἀρχων can refer to many different Jewish leaders (see above and Luke 14:1; 23:13, 35; 24:20; Acts 3:17; 13:27; 14:5; 23:5), but it also refers to other rulers and officials (Luke 11:15; 12:58; 18:18; Acts 7:27, 35; 14:5; 16:19) including cognates ὁ ἑκατονάρχης (Luke 7:2; Acts 10:1), ὁ ἀσιάρχης (Acts 19:31), ὁ χιλίαρχης (Acts 21:31-32; 24:22; 25:23), and ὁ τετραάρχης (Luke 9:7; Acts 13:1), a title given to ‘Herod’.

⁴⁷ F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. Robert W. Funk (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 230 (§ 444); BDAG, 993; J. K. Elliott, ‘Τε in the New Testament,’ *TZ* 46 (1990): 202–203; Morten Hørning Jensen, *Herod Antipas in Galilee*, WUNT 215 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 120. This may be

those listed in the interpretation of the psalm. Since the verb is plural it makes little sense to understand ‘Herod’ and Pontius Pilate as independent subjects of this verb; these two must be understood with the Gentiles and people of Israel as the collective subject of the verb.⁴⁸ The implication for our present purposes is that Luke views ‘Herod’ as a representative king *and* ruler.⁴⁹

In light of the Psalm, ‘Herod’, as a representative king and ruler, must necessarily be counted among the hostile enemies of God and the Messiah. This hostility is the key character trait that Luke assigns to composite ‘Herod’. The remainder of this chapter will examine Luke’s characterisation of ‘Herod’ in relation to each of the key protagonists that Acts 4:25-27 recalls or anticipates: John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles/early church. The connection with Jesus is obvious; Acts 4:27 interprets Psa 2:1-2 and indicts ‘Herod’ and Pontius Pilate in Jesus’ execution. The recall of ‘Herod’s’ hostility toward John the Baptist is more subtle in Acts 4, but by placing ‘Herod’ and Pilate in this narrative context along with Annas and Caiaphas as the joint antecedents of αὐτῶν (Acts 4:29) he recalls the only other context in which all four appear together: Luke 3:1-2, the introduction to John’s ministry in Luke-Acts. Acts 4:25-27 also anticipates ‘Herod’s’ antagonism toward the apostles and church in Acts 12 as Luke portrays the early Jerusalem community interpreting their own experiences in light of and as an extension of ‘Herod’s’

another instance of the author recalling his passion narrative as Luke 23:12 also contains a similar construction (ὁ τε Ἡρώδης καὶ ὁ Πιλάτος).

⁴⁸ Jack T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1987), 13.

⁴⁹ Much attention has been afforded to Pilate in this context due to his prominent place in the synoptic passion traditions as well as later Christian tradition. On Luke’s depiction of Pilate see Helen K. Bond, *Pontius Pilate in History and Interpretation*, SNTSMS 100 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 138–162. As I state above, Luke’s use of these titles elsewhere for ‘Herod’ provides us with evidence internal to the narrative itself for positing that ‘Herod’ is a composite character.

involvement in Jesus' crucifixion. We begin, however, with Luke 1:5 which prepares for the ends of both John's and Jesus' public careers by setting their births during the reign of 'Herod'.⁵⁰

Setting Narrative Tension: Luke 1:5

Context of Luke 1:5

Luke 1-2 are intended 'to introduce not only the Gospel but the whole of Luke's two volume work'.⁵¹ These chapters introduce several of the central themes of the narrative, e.g., the centrality of Jerusalem and the Temple and a concern for women.⁵² However, as is evident, the focus lies on introducing two main characters through narratives of the births of John and Jesus in parallel fashion.⁵³ Though the births of John and Jesus parallel each other, Jesus is consistently depicted as the superior of the two⁵⁴ in accord with Jesus' role as the promised Davidic Messiah who

⁵⁰ John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary*, The New Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 24.

⁵¹ Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSS 110 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 85. The dismissal of the Lukan birth narrative by Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, Trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), 18–27 is unwarranted and, for a narrative study such as this one, inappropriate. For a rebuttal of Conzelmann, see Joseph B. Tyson, 'The Birth Narratives and the Beginning of Luke's Gospel,' *Sem* 52 (1990): 103–120; Paul Minear, 'Luke's Use of Birth Stories,' in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 124–125; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 20–44.

⁵² Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 2nd ed. (London: Chapman, 1993), 237–238; Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 79; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 164–171.

⁵³ Brown, *Birth*, 251; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 313–316. As Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 16 states, the parallels between John and Jesus' births indicate that they are part of a single, divine purpose. See also Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1988), 15; Larry Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003), 327.

⁵⁴ Cf. Luke 1:41 and Brown, *Birth*, 283–285, 341; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 51.

will occupy the throne over the house of Jacob, ruling as king⁵⁵ and Son of God (Luke 1:32-33, 35; 2:11).⁵⁶ In sum, in the birth narratives reveal John to be the prophetic forerunner of the Messiah (Luke 1:76). Jesus is that Messiah, and as such, is set to rule over the people of God eternally.

Admittedly, 'Herod' plays only a very small part in the development of one of these Lukan themes. The portrayal of 'Herod' as king creates tension in the story as it stands as the backdrop of the announcement and birth of the true king, Jesus, and the one who prepares the way for Jesus' public ministry. Moessner states that 'Herod'

will figure prominently in John the Baptist's career, whose fate in turn prefigures the lot of Jesus who will meet this Herod again at the 'end' during the process of his 'trial' that results in his crucifixion....Are we perhaps to hear that, above all, Israel's own 'king' [Herod] was instrumental in fulfilling the plot of Israel's own 'suffering' Messiah?⁵⁷

We answer Moessner's question affirmatively as we examine Luke's characterisation of Herod in this and subsequent passages.

⁵⁵ The kingship of Jesus is an important Lukan motif. See Johnson, *Luke*, 37; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 115; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 348. On the connection between Jesus' kingship and the kingdom of God in Luke see John Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, WBC 35a (Waco: Word, 1989), 52; Luke T. Johnson, 'The Lukan Kingship Parable (Lk. 19:11-27),' *NovT* 24 (1982): 139-159.

⁵⁶ As Brown, *Birth*, 242-243 indicates, in this way the birth of Jesus is the culmination of Israel's history. See *Ibid.*, 309-312 and Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 88-89 on Jesus in these roles. On Jesus as Lord in Luke-Acts, see C. Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, BZNTW 139 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006). For Jesus as Davidic/Royal Messiah see Luke 22:29 where God confers the Kingdom on Jesus. Jesus is depicted as the Son of God in Luke 3-4 through the proclamation of God at Jesus' baptism (3:21-22), the genealogy (3:38), and the devil's repeated use of this appellation (4:3, 9).

⁵⁷ David P. Moessner, "Listening Posts" Along the Way: "Synchronisms" as Metaleptic Prompts to the "Continuity of the Narrative" in Polybius' Histories and in Luke's Gospel-Acts. A Tribute to David E. Aune,' in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context*, ed. John Fotopoulos, *SupNovT* 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 139.

Ἡρώδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας is the first character of the narrative.⁵⁸ The introductory phrase ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις⁵⁹ provides a context for his narrative, the reign of ‘Herod’ the king.⁶⁰ The epithet ‘king of Judaea’ reminds us that ‘Herod’, as a king, is a representative political opponent of Jesus (cf. Acts 4:25-27). This title contributes to the consistently negative characterisation of ‘Herod’ throughout the narrative.

Regarding ‘Herod’ as ‘King’ we note that kings other than Jesus or God are, for the most part, negatively depicted in Luke-Acts. The few positive depictions of kings include the king who calculates the cost of war as a model of Christian discipleship (Luke 14:31), the Pharaoh who promoted Joseph (Acts 7:10), and King David (Acts 13:22). Apart from these incidental positive references, the title is applied to an oppressive Pharaoh (Acts 7:18), and Saul, the first king of Israel whom God removed from power (Acts 13:21). At Luke 22:24-30 the kings of the Gentiles

⁵⁸ Aside from interest in Herod the Great’s role in a conflation of Matthew’s and Luke’s birth stories, scholars regularly ignore Herod as a character in this context and the conspicuous place Luke gives him at the beginning of his narrative. Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 317 is typical in that he sees the reference to ‘Herod, King of Judea’ as providing a historical time and place as the backdrop to the birth narratives. Similarly, Craig Evans, *Luke*, NIBC 3 (Peabody: Hendricksen, 1990), 21–25; Francois Bovon, *Luke 1*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002), 33. Tyson, ‘Birth Narratives,’ 106–107 draws attention to various passages that might serve as ‘beginnings’ of Luke’s gospel (1:1, 5; 3:1-2, 23; 4:1, 23) but says nothing of the role ‘Herod’ plays in two of these passages as well as the subsequent narrative.

⁵⁹ This phrase, likely taken over from the LXX (and therefore an extratextual matter), is common in Luke-Acts. Eighteen of the twenty-four NT occurrences of the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις (with several minor variations) are in Luke-Acts. The exact phrase occurs three times in Luke-Acts (Luke 1:5; 17:26, 28) and three other times with δέ (Luke 2:1; 6:12; Acts 9:37). I. Howard Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 51; Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, 5th ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1901), 45. Regarding the Septuagintal influence on Luke-Acts see especially Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 116–125, 312. Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 25, 34–35; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 33; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 75 see the reference to the days of Herod, king of Judea as recalling the OT ‘period of the kings of Judah and thus the deeds of God in that setting.’

⁶⁰ See particularly the introductions to prophetic works e.g., Jer 1:2-3; Amos 1:1; Mic 1:1; Zeph 1:1; also 2 Kings 15:29; 23:22; 2 Chr 32:26; Est 1:1; Dan 2:44; Zech 14:5; cf. Matt 2:1. Johnson, *Luke*, 34; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 47–48, 64; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 25; Carroll, *Luke*, 25.

lord their authority over their subjects in contrast to the authority of Jesus and his followers, which is gained through humble service. Kings are part of a larger matrix of authority figures who persecute both Jesus (Acts 4:25-27) and Jesus' disciples (Luke 21:12), a matrix of which 'Herod' is a part (Acts 4:25-27; 12:1-5).⁶¹

Corroborating this negative depiction of kings is the suggestion that all earthly rulers exercise authority delegated to them by the devil.⁶² Specifically for our purposes, the story of Jesus' temptation (4:1-13) indicates that the devil has been granted authority over all the kingdoms of the world (Luke 4:5-6). Bovon writes, 'This implies that the princes receive power and glory...from the devil.'⁶³ In this way, 'Herod's' rule over Judaea falls under the authority of the devil.⁶⁴ Given that the key facet in the depiction of the devil/Satan is primarily his opposition to Jesus, it is safe to conclude that 'Herod', as a recipient of the devil's authority, opposes Jesus as well.⁶⁵

⁶¹ Richard B. Vinson, 'The Minas Touch: Anti-Kingship Rhetoric in the Gospel of Luke,' *PRSt* 35 (2008): 77-78.

⁶² I will revisit this issue in the section on Luke 23:6-12 below, a passage that refers explicitly to 'Herod's' ἐξουσία. I will also relate this matter to the characterisation of 'Herod' in chapter six. On the devil in Luke-Acts see Bovon, *Luke 1*, 141-142. Διάβολος only occurs in the Lukan narratives at Luke 4:2, 3, 6, 13; 8:12; Acts 10:38; 13:10. In these passages the devil is clearly opposed to Jesus, potential hearers of the message of Jesus and humanity in general. If we consider the synonymous term σατανᾶς (Luke 10:18; 11:18; 13:16; 22:3, 31; Acts 5:3; 26:18) we learn that part of Paul's commission was to lead people from the rule of Satan to the rule of God (Acts 26:18). On διάβολος and σατανᾶς as synonymous terms see LN 12.34 (and p. 145, n. 4).

⁶³ Ibid., 144; Johnson, *Luke*, 74; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 375-376. *Contra* Marshall, *Luke*, 172 who concludes that the devil's claim of authority over the kingdoms of the world is simply not true.

⁶⁴ As Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 194 points out, the narrative indicates that Caesar exercises authority over the whole world at 2:1-2 when he orders the census. Therefore, Caesar's power is delegated as well.

⁶⁵ 'Herod's' ruling under the authority of the devil will be explored more fully in chapter six.

If ‘Herod’ is king, then a second king is a rival. In this context, the second king is Jesus, who, as a descendant of David,⁶⁶ will be granted David’s throne by God and rule over the house of Jacob forever (1:32-33).⁶⁷ Luke-Acts indicates that Jesus is a legitimate descendant of David (Luke 1:68-69; 2:4, 11; 3:31) and has received the promises made to David (Acts 2:30-36; 13:32-37).⁶⁸ Correlation of Jesus as the Son of David and the Son of the Most High establishes Jesus’ divine status.⁶⁹ Therefore, in the Lukan narrative, Jesus is not the rival king, ‘Herod’ is.⁷⁰ We agree with Richardson who writes concerning the depiction of Jesus as the Messianic king in both Luke and Matthew ‘necessarily required that Jesus as messiah and Herod as king conflict directly in the birth accounts’.⁷¹

Word play creatively highlights this impending conflict in the narrative:

‘Herod’ is βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας (Luke 1:5) and Jesus is ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων

⁶⁶ Ferdinand Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*, trans. Harold Knight and George Ogg (London: Camelot Press Ltd., 1969), 258–260, 263–264 rightly notes that the mention of Joseph’s descent from David (Luke 1:27) establishes Jesus’ right to the throne of David, but he ignores the angelic revelation at 1:32-33 which makes Jesus’ right explicit.

⁶⁷ Marshall, *Luke*, 67–68.

⁶⁸ Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 328 states that Jesus’ royal messianic status as the son of David is at the core of the birth narrative traditions. On Davidic messianism in Luke-Acts see Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 52; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 25–26; Robert L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet*, JSNTSS 62 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 230–233. Given Jesus’ Davidic descent and the eternality of his rule, there is little doubt that God’s covenant with David is in view here (2 Sam 7:1-17, particularly vv. 12-13, 16). See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 338; Brown, *Birth*, 312; Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 95; D. M. Smith, ‘Luke 1:26-38,’ *Int* 29 (1975): 412; Johnson, *Luke*, 37; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 51; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 113–116; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 88; Christopher Francis Evans, *Saint Luke*, TPINTC (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1990), 162. This builds on the OT imagery of YHWH as king of Israel (1 Sam 12:12; 1 Kings 22:19; Isa 6:5; 24:23; 33:22; Zeph 3:15; Zech 14:16) with the descendant of David ruling from the throne of God (1 Chr 17:14; 28:5; 29:23; 2 Chr 9:8; 13:8).

⁶⁹ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 25–26 states that this theme is developed throughout the narrative. Hahn, *Titles*, 263; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 21 states that the earthly Jesus is the Son of David and the resurrected Jesus is the Son of God, but this misses the correlation between the two titles at Luke 1:32-33.

⁷⁰ Carroll, *Luke*, 25.

⁷¹ Peter Richardson, *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 295–296.

(Luke 23:3, 37-38). These two respective epithets are important aspects of ‘Herod’s’ and Jesus’ characterisation. Ἰουδαία and Ἰουδαίος are obviously related semantically⁷² and this overlap between the two terms highlights the tension between the two kings. ‘Herod’ rules Ἰουδαία (Luke 1:5; Acts 12:1, 19), a political territory in Luke-Acts (Luke 1:5; 6:17; Acts 2:9; 10:37).⁷³ Jesus and his disciples minister in Judaea (Luke 4:44; 7:17; Acts 1:8; 11:1), sometimes successfully (Luke 7:17; Acts 9:31). However, Judaea, along with Galilee, is a place from where opposition toward Jesus arises (Luke 5:17). Ultimately, Jerusalem will be destroyed and the inhabitants of Judaea dispersed by an invading army (Luke 21:20-24). Therefore, ‘Herod’s’ kingdom, like its king, is a source of opposition to Jesus that is destined to be obliterated by invading armies, thereby making his rule futile and finally a failure in contrast to the eternal rule of Jesus.⁷⁴

On the other hand, Jesus reigns over τῶν Ἰουδαίων, which apart from its adjectival use (e.g., Luke 23:51; Acts 13:6), refers to the people of Ἰουδαία, presumably ‘Herod’s’ subjects (e.g. Acts 2:5; 16:3; 24:24). Acts 28:24 sums up the nature of these people: sometimes they are receptive to Jesus, his followers, and the message of the kingdom of God (cf. Luke 23:51; Acts 2:14; 13:43; 18:19; 19:10-17; 21:20-21), but often they stand in opposition (Luke 23:2-3; Acts 9:23; 12:3, 11; 13:50; 14:2-5, 19; 17:5, 13; 20:3, 19; 21:11, 27; 22:30; 23:12). At first glance this seems paradoxical, for we may think that if Jesus is king then his subjects would

⁷² See LN 93.486-487; BDAG, 477-478.

⁷³ Minear, ‘Birth Stories,’ 126–127 points out the importance of place names that occur in the birth narrative and are repeated throughout Luke-Acts. We have addressed the occasional overlap between Judaea and Galilee above.

⁷⁴ As Luke 1:52 indicates, the powerful on thrones will be lowered by God.

naturally submit to his leadership. However, this is clearly not the case in Luke-Acts as Simeon's prophecy (Luke 2:34) and the parable of the minas reflect (Luke 19:11-27).⁷⁵ Further reinforcing this depiction of Ἰουδαίων, the narrative of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem contains a declaration of the crowd that evidences both acceptance and rejection of Jesus' kingship (Luke 19:28-40).⁷⁶

Luke 1:5 begins the birth narratives of the third gospel, two chapters which introduce Jesus as the Davidic Messiah/Son of God who will reign over the people of God forever, a messianic depiction of Jesus that develops throughout Luke-Acts. The significance of 'Herod' is evident as he is the first character in the narrative. The portrayal of 'Herod' as 'King' anticipates conflict between the ruling King and the true king born during his reign. The repeated appearance of 'Herod' in the narrative of Jesus' ministry must be read in light of this sense of impending conflict and 'Herod's' opposition toward the Lord and His Messiah as indicated by Acts 4:27.

However, before Jesus' ministry begins in earnest at Luke 3:22, John the Baptist must accomplish his preparatory prophetic ministry. With the naming of 'Herod' at Luke 1:5 as the rival to Jesus, it is no surprise that John's preparation for the true king meets opposition from 'Herod' as well. John reappears in the narrative at Luke 3:1-20, preaching to crowds who receive his message of repentance and baptism. By way of contrast, 'Herod' emerges to reject John's preaching, imprisoning and eventually executing the prophet.

⁷⁵ Johnson, 'Lukan Kingship Parable,' 156.

⁷⁶ See Frank Matera, *The Kingship of Jesus*, SBLDS 66 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982), 83.

‘Herod’ and John the Baptist

Context of Luke 3:1-20

The narrative of Luke 3:1-20 relates the ministry of John the Baptist,⁷⁷ focusing on ‘his person (vv. 1-6), his mission (vv. 7-17), and a summary of the end of his career (vv. 18-20)’.⁷⁸ Following the birth and infancy narratives, this passage continues paralleling John and Jesus, consistently showing the superiority of Jesus.⁷⁹ John is a prophet (cf. Luke 1:76), and in the narrative of Luke 3:1-20 prepares for the ministry of Jesus with John portrayed as the ‘Isaianic herald of redemption’⁸⁰ as well as an Elijah-like figure.⁸¹ As a preparatory prophet, John goes out κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (Luke 3:3)⁸² thereby anticipating the proclamation of both Jesus and the disciples.⁸³ Though John’s preparatory role ends abruptly (Luke 3:20), he remains a significant character throughout the narrative,

⁷⁷ Richardson, *Herod*, 297; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 452; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 118. See Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*, SNTSMS 7 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 42–86; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 47–51; Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 145–152; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 29–31; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 279–280 for an overview of John’s role in the third gospel.

⁷⁸ Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 29. Oddly, Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 153–154 divides the text between vv. 18 and 19 rather than 17 and 18. As I discuss below, 3:18 is linked to 3:19 by a μὲν...δέ construction.

⁷⁹ See above on Luke 1:5 and Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 149–150.

⁸⁰ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 170; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 30. This represents a redaction of Mark 1:2-3 in which a lengthier section of Isa 40 (vv. 3-5) is cited. On the Lukan redaction here, see Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 451–452, 460–461.

⁸¹ Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 62, 70 though, as Webb indicates, the Elijah theme is not as prominent in Luke as it is in Matthew. On John’s preparatory role see Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 452; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 30; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 48. The synchronism (3:1-2) also sets John up as a prophet in the OT tradition, especially as he follows the synchronism with the phrase ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (cf. Jer 1:2; Ezek 1:3; Hos 1:1; Joel 1:1; Mic 1:1). See Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 62; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 30.

⁸² Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 48 rightly states that this phrase summarises John’s role in Luke-Acts.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 1:51–52.

sending his own disciples to inquire about Jesus' messianic status (Luke 7:18-23) and being recalled at times in Acts (1:22; 10:37).⁸⁴

As for 'Herod', not only is this character one of the various rulers at 3:1-2, but of all the rulers named there, 'Herod' is the one who rejects John's message of repentance and imprisons the Baptist, effectively ending John's ministry in the third gospel (Luke 3:19-20).⁸⁵ In this way, the rule and antagonism of 'Herod' serve as an *inclusio* for the story of John the Baptist. As a further parallel between John and Jesus, the former's imprisonment by 'Herod' anticipates Jesus' eventual suffering in which 'Herod' will play a part.⁸⁶

Setting the Stage: Luke 3:1-2

Luke 3:1-2 reminds us of Acts 4 as 'Herod' the ruler (τραπεζάρχῃ) appears alongside other rulers including three other opponents of Jesus and the early Christians: Pilate, Annas, and Caiaphas.⁸⁷ Green, noting that the narrative has already shown a bias against rulers in general (Luke 1:52-53), sees the rulers listed here as hostile forces along with the Jewish crowds (3:7-9) and the devil (4:1-13).⁸⁸ In order to gain a fuller understanding of 'Herod' we must briefly discuss the depiction of these other hostile characters as the characterisation of all of them informs the

⁸⁴ Ibid., 1:48. Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 60–70.

⁸⁵ John's imprisonment creates a clear break between his and Jesus' respective ministries in Luke. See Johnson, *Luke*, 67; Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 63; Wink, *John the Baptist*, 46.

⁸⁶ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 53.

⁸⁷ So Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 140; Walter Brueggemann, 'Luke 3:1-4,' *Int* 30 (1976): 405–406.

⁸⁸ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 161, 168. Moessner, 'Listening Posts,' 138 notes that the synchronisms of Luke-Acts repeatedly point to the powers and rulers who will oppose and reject Jesus. I discuss the role of the devil in relation to the various rulers in the narrative on Luke 1:5 above and in the next chapter.

characterisation of the others. We begin with Pilate who, as we have seen above, is linked to ‘Herod’ in several contexts.

Though Pilate does not appear in the Lukan narrative as often as ‘Herod’, the portrayal of him is not flattering. A side comment made by a group of people who bring the matter to Jesus’ attention recounts an incident of Pilate mixing the blood of some Galileans with their sacrifices, casting Pilate as a murderer (Luke 13:1).⁸⁹ Pilate also appears in his usual role in the gospel traditions as the Roman judge in Jesus’ trial. Though Pilate declares Jesus innocent of the charges brought against him three times (Luke 23:4, 14, 22) and desires to set Jesus free (Luke 23:16, 20, 22; cf. Acts 3:13), he finally capitulates to the pressures of the chief priests and rulers of the Jewish people to order Jesus’ crucifixion (Luke 23:24; Acts 3:13; 13:28).⁹⁰ Though the narrative of Luke 23 seems to indict the Jewish leaders in Jesus’ death, as we have seen above, both Pilate and ‘Herod’ are at fault in Jesus’ death (Acts 4:27).⁹¹ This all adds up to a very unflattering depiction of Pilate as a brutal murderer who fails to serve justice because he is a weak-willed judge and ultimately complicit in Jesus’ death.⁹² Just as at Acts 4:27, ‘Herod’ and Pilate appear together here at Luke 3:1, a passage which anticipates their collusion against Jesus later in the narrative.

⁸⁹ Bond, *Pontius Pilate*, 151. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, AB 28a (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 1006–1007 discusses the various proposals for the historical event behind this story. Harold W. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas: A Contemporary of Jesus Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980), 180 speculates that the incident mentioned here was the cause of Pilate and Herod’s animosity, which was resolved by their agreement in Jesus’ trial (Luke 23:12). We simply do not know. This is obviously not elaborated upon in the narrative. Our concern here is Luke’s depiction of Pilate as a murderer in this instance.

⁹⁰ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 168 states that by naming Pilate at 3:1, Luke sets the tension between the ruler and Jesus that reaches its climax in the passion narrative. We could say the same thing about ‘Herod’ given his role in the execution of Jesus in Luke.

⁹¹ As Bond, *Pontius Pilate*, 158 states, Luke is the only evangelist who states that Pilate passed a sentence on Jesus.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 154, 158–159.

The same phenomenon – guilt by narrative association – occurs with Annas and Caiaphas, the high priests (though to a lesser extent).⁹³ Given that Annas and Caiaphas are named here, it seems that they are in view when the term ἀρχιερεύς appears.⁹⁴ Ἀρχιερεύς refers to Jerusalem leaders who stand in opposition to Jesus and his followers either directly (Luke 9:22; 19:47; 20:1, 19; 22:66; Acts 4:5-6; 5:17, 21) or by employing the services of Saul for the purposes of persecuting the church (Acts 9:1-2, 14; 22:5; 26:12). The ἀρχιερεῖς are the primary accusers of both Jesus (Luke 22-23) and Paul (Acts 22-26). Their desire to kill Jesus (Luke 22:2, 4, 52; 23:10) is fulfilled (Luke 24:20) and they are similarly responsible for Stephen's death (Acts 7). Even more so than Pilate, the ἀρχιερεῖς are cast in a very negative light. The association of the high/chief priests with 'Herod' is our concern and, as with the linking of 'Herod' and Pilate, these characters are complicit in Jesus' death and opposition toward the other protagonists of the narrative (Luke 22-23; Acts 4:25-28).⁹⁵

Returning to our main character, Luke 3:1 informs us that 'Herod' rules Galilee. Therefore, the portrayal of Galilee will also contribute to the characterisation of 'Herod'. Galilee is Jesus' home (Luke 1:26; 2:4, 39; 4:14, 16) and is sometimes a place of successful ministry (Luke 4:31-44; 23:49; Acts 13:31). However, it is also

⁹³ See Helen K. Bond, *Caiaphas: Friend of Rome and Judge of Jesus* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2004), 111–112; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 140; Marshall, *Luke*, 134; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 169 on the use of the singular with reference to two individuals at 3:2. This odd grammatical construction is likely due to the continued influence of Annas despite his deposition, since Jews considered the high priesthood a lifetime appointment. These are historical matters. Narratively, we may see this as another example of conflation.

⁹⁴ So Bond, *Caiaphas*, 116, with the obvious exception of Acts 19:14.

⁹⁵ Johnson, *Luke*, 64. On the association of the high/chief priests with Pilate at Luke 23:4, 10, 13.

the first place Jesus is directly opposed (Luke 4:14-30)⁹⁶ and is named alongside Jerusalem and Judaea as places from where religious leaders come to oppose Jesus (Luke 5:17—6:11).⁹⁷ Thus, the portrayal of Galilee accords with what is revealed elsewhere about ‘Herod’ – both ruler and ruled reject Jesus.

Though brief, this synchronism puts ‘Herod’ in a negative light as ‘Herod’ is aligned with several of the key opponents of Jesus in the narrative. This is expected as our exegesis of Acts 4:25-27 has shown that kings and rulers oppose the Lord and the Messiah. Both Acts 4:25-27 and Luke 3:1-2 look to ‘Herod’s’ rejection of and opposition toward Jesus. We are not surprised when ‘Herod’ reappears at 3:19 rejecting the message of the one whose prophetic ministry prepares for Jesus’ ministry.

Rejecting John’s Message: Luke 3:18-20

Τετρααρχοῦντος τῆς Γαλιλαίας Ἡρώδου (3:1) and Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης (3:19) provide an *inclusio* for the ministry of John in the third gospel⁹⁸ and focus attention on ‘Herod’ as a key figure in Luke-Acts.⁹⁹ Given the hostility of several of those named at Luke 3:1-2, ‘Herod’s’ re-emergence here as a hearer of John the

⁹⁶ Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 200. Nolland notes that this scene anticipates Jesus’ passion.

⁹⁷ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 581.

⁹⁸ Evans, *Saint Luke*, 244. John’s ministry is essentially over at this point in the third gospel. The only other action John undertakes in Luke is sending two of his disciples to inquire about Jesus’ Messianic identity (7:18-24). John does not even play an active role in Jesus’ baptism (3:21-22). There is also no extended, dramatic scene surrounding John’s beheading (9:7-9, cf. Mark 6:14-29; Matt 14:1-12). As Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989), 104 states, Luke 3:19-20 is a ‘drastic reduction’ of Mark 6:14-29.

⁹⁹ Here I disagree with Carroll, *Luke*, 90 who states that Herod is only a bit player in Luke-Acts. The expanded role that Luke gives to ‘Herod’ as a composite character (and, from a historical perspective, Herod Antipas as antagonist to both John and Jesus) speaks against this assessment.

Baptist cannot (and does not) end well. Luke 3:18-20 includes the first explicit statements that develop the characterisation of ‘Herod’ as one who takes his stand against the Lord and his anointed. Specifically, ‘Herod’ is an evil, sinful ruler who refuses to heed John the Baptist’s rebuke and subsequently imprisons and executes God’s prophet. Darr’s assessment sums this up well, ‘...it becomes evident that he [Herod] is indeed the political antagonist of John.’¹⁰⁰

The broad depiction of ‘Herod’ in this passage is a description of him as the only character in his narrative who ἐποίησεν πονηρῶν. As Gowler writes, ‘The most explicit message occurs through direct definition, the overt naming or judgment of someone’s qualities.’¹⁰¹ In the third gospel, evil people are capable of doing right (Luke 11:13), but generally speaking, evil people’s actions reflect their inherently evil character (Luke 6:43-45).¹⁰² According to the Lukan Jesus, those who belong to an evil generation seek a sign (Luke 11:29) as ‘Herod’ eventually does (Luke 23:8).¹⁰³ I agree with Green who states that the description of ‘Herod’ as ἐποίησεν πονηρῶν portrays the ruler ‘as possessing a history of evil deeds’, opposing God, and opposing God’s messenger.¹⁰⁴ This assessment of ‘Herod’ is undeniably negative – he is an evil-doer.

¹⁰⁰ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 152.

¹⁰¹ David B. Gowler, ‘Characterization in Luke: A Socio-Narratological Approach,’ *BTB* 19 (1989): 55.

¹⁰² Note that Paul is declared innocent of evil (Acts 25:18; 28:21) as was Jesus (Luke 23:22, though the term used there is the synonym κακός. On these synonyms, see LN 88.106, 110).

¹⁰³ Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1481; Francois Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53)*, EKK 3.4 (Düsseldorf: Neukirchener, 2009), 403; John Nolland, *Luke 18:35--24:53*, WBC 35c (Waco: Word, 1993), 1123 see Luke 11:29-30 as the inspiration for Luke 23:8. Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, vol. 1 (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 770 points out that the devil also sought a sign from Jesus (Luke 4:9-12). See below on Luke 23:8 for more on this matter.

¹⁰⁴ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 183. See also Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 369 who believes that Herod’s evil deeds pertain to other violations of Jewish piety besides his marriage to his brother’s wife.

Among the evil deeds done by ‘Herod’, three are listed in this context: his marriage to his brother’s wife, his failure to hear John’s rebuke, and his subsequent imprisonment of John.¹⁰⁵ First, we learn of John’s rebuke concerning ‘Herod’s’ marriage to his brother’s wife, Herodias.¹⁰⁶ John’s rebuke accords with his message in Luke 3:7-17 which is to call those in positions of power who practice evil to repentance.¹⁰⁷ As for John’s rebuke of ‘Herod’, later in the narrative Jesus prohibits marrying a divorced woman (Luke 16:18). Also, Luke 20:27-40 assumes the death of a brother before the brother’s widow may remarry. However, ‘Herod’s’ brother, Philip, is ruling Ituraea and Trachonitis and therefore, is still alive (Luke 3:1). Both Luke 16:18 and 20:27-40 provide the narrative parameters for understanding John’s rebuke of ‘Herod’ as inherently wrong.¹⁰⁸ This sinful marriage, however, is only one of the many evil things ‘Herod’ had done. Second, Luke contrasts ‘Herod’s’ response to John’s rebuke with the responses of others to John’s proclamation of the good

¹⁰⁵ Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 166 states that the confrontation of the prophet with a political ruler anticipates a violent end for John. We disagree with Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 115 who claims that ‘all the evil’ is left unspecified at this point and that Herod’s imprisonment of John is simply ‘added’ to the multitude of evil deeds he had done.

¹⁰⁶ Narratively, for Luke, the brother is Philip (3:1). Jos. *Ant.* 18.136 states that Herodias was married to Herod III (son of Herod the Great and Mariamne). Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 266–269 argues that Josephus was somewhat mistaken due to lack of information regarding the Herodians in the first few decades of the first century and claims that Herodias was married to both Herod III and Philip before Antipas. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 135, n.7; Richardson, *Herod*, 307–308, n.59 agree with Josephus that Herodias was only married to Herod III. Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 477 states that the identity of Herodias’ previous husband is unknown.

¹⁰⁷ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 157.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. Darr continues by noting two OT stories that may lie behind this narrative: Nathan’s rebuke of David (2 Sam 11:27b–12:15) and Elijah’s rebukes of Ahab and Jezebel (1 Kgs 17-22). Most commentators believe Luke has Lev 18:16 and/or 20:21 in view here, e.g., Evans, *Luke*, 49; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 477–478; Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 167; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 156; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 328; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 183; Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 366–367. These scholars are likely correct, but our methodology gives precedence to intra-textual explanations for matters such as these.

news (μὲν...δέ)¹⁰⁹ thereby indicating that ‘Herod’ has rejected the good news that John proclaims.¹¹⁰ In the preceding context, those listening to John respond by asking τί ποιήσωμεν (3:10, 12, 14), thus implying their repentance (cf. Acts 2:37).¹¹¹ Third, and in contrast to the others who have heard and responded rightly to John’s message, the ruler imprisons John, which is the climax of his evil deeds according to this text.¹¹² Imprisoning John, the forerunner of the Messiah, is ‘Herod’s’ first step in taking his stand against the Lord and his anointed as narrated in Acts 4:25-27.¹¹³ This confrontation between John and ‘Herod’ concludes with John in prison; the confrontation ends at Luke 9:9 when Luke’s ‘Herod’ states plainly that he beheaded John.

‘Herod’ Beheaded John: Luke 9:9¹¹⁴

If imprisoning John was the climax of ‘Herod’s’ evil deeds at Luke 3:20, the *coup de grâce* of his hostility toward John comes at Luke 9:9. The significant redaction of Mark 6:14-29 at Luke 9:7-9 serves to place the blame for John’s death

¹⁰⁹ I disagree with Carroll, *Luke*, 95–96 who states that the point of the narrative is the contrast between the responses of the people and those with power and influence to John’s preaching. Several powerful groups (tax collectors and soldiers) are among those who respond rightly to John’s preaching.

¹¹⁰ W. C. Van Unnik, ‘The “Book of Acts”: The Confirmation of the Gospel,’ *NovT* 4 (1960): 31; Marshall, *Luke*, 149. Pace Bovon, *Luke 1*, 127; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 183 both of whom see this construction as merely connective and transitional. The μὲν...δέ is indeed connective, but the context also implies a contrast.

¹¹¹ Though we remember that some of λαοὺς Ἰσραὴλ (Acts 4:25-27; τοῦ λαοῦ at 3:3) ultimately oppose Jesus.

¹¹² Bovon, *Luke 1*, 127–128; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 329.

¹¹³ This also foreshadows Jesus’ prophecy that his disciples would appear before political rulers and its subsequent fulfilment (Luke 21:12; cf. Acts 5:17-26; 8:3; 12:1-19; 16:22ff; 22:4; 26:10).

¹¹⁴ On the context of Luke 9:7-9, see below.

squarely on ‘Herod’.¹¹⁵ In Mark,¹¹⁶ Herod imprisons John (Mark 1:14; 6:17) and beheads him (Mark 6:16). However, the prolonged Markan narrative indicates that though Herod feared John, he gladly heard the prophet (Mark 6:20) and was grieved by the need to keep his promise to grant the request of Herodias’ daughter for John’s head on a platter (Mark 6:26). In the second gospel, it was Herod’s wife who held a grudge against John (Mark 6:19). Ultimately in Mark, Herod sends a soldier to behead John (Mark 6:27).¹¹⁷ In contrast, the third gospel contains only a single, blunt declaration by ‘Herod’, Ἰωάννην ἐγὼ ἀνεκεφάλισα (Luke 9:9).¹¹⁸ While the Markan account indicates that Herodias, Herodias’ daughter, an executioner, and Herod all played a part in John’s death, the Lukan version contains neither sharing of blame nor grief on the part of the ruler. In Luke’s gospel, ‘Herod’ is John’s judge, jury, and executioner.¹¹⁹ The only words spoken by ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts are an admission of his guilt in the death of God’s prophet, John.¹²⁰ With this declaration by ‘Herod’, Luke ends the story of the ruler’s opposition toward John.

¹¹⁵ On the other issues concerning Luke’s redaction of Mark at this point, see Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 185; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 757; Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 336.

¹¹⁶ We remember that the second evangelist calls Herod (Antipas) a ‘King’ in his version of this story. This is, technically speaking, incorrect. We have discussed how the terms ‘King’ and ‘Tetrarch’ are used interchangeably above. We agree with Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, AB 27 (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 398–399 who states that Mark has an anti-tyrannical polemic in view with his usage of the term.

¹¹⁷ The Matthean account of this story (14:1-12) removes Mark’s statement that Herod beheaded John (Mark 6:16) and replaces it with Herod’s desire to kill John (Matt 14:5). Matthew, following Mark, does note Herod’s grief over having to keep his promise to Herodias’ daughter (14:9) and sending another to execute John (14:10). On this, see Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, SP 1 (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991), 217.

¹¹⁸ Also absent from the Lukan account is Herod’s belief that Jesus was John raised from the dead (contrast Mark 6:16). In Luke, the belief that Jesus was John *redivivus* is an opinion of the general population (9:7, 19).

¹¹⁹ Carroll, *Luke*, 205.

¹²⁰ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 167.

Conclusion: 'Herod' and John

The encounter between John and 'Herod', though brief, characterises 'Herod' in a manner that leaves no room for any redeeming qualities in the ruler.¹²¹ The narrative singles out 'Herod' from among several political and religious opponents by use of an *inclusio* at Luke 3:1, 19. As a character, 'Herod' is a sinful, evil ruler who rejects the good news proclaimed by God's prophet. 'Herod's' evil deeds escalate in the story as the ruler imprisons (Luke 3:18-20) and finally beheads John (Luke 9:9).¹²² In this way, John the Baptist is the first of many who will be rejected and suffer at the hands of those who do not heed the message of God in Luke-Acts.¹²³ Green asks,

If this is the lot of those who identify fundamentally with God's redemptive aim and carry out his mission, what will happen to the one for whom John's ministry was a preparation?¹²⁴

As Luke-Acts significantly expands upon the negative characteristics of 'Herod' with the ruler stands against Jesus, the central protagonist of the *Doppelwerk*, the answer anticipated by Green's question is answered. We will see that 'Herod' continues his evil deeds by rejecting Jesus' message (implied at Luke 8:3; Acts 13:1), expressing blatant hostility toward Jesus (Luke 9:7-9; 13:31-35), mocking Jesus as king (Luke 23:10), and being held responsible for Jesus' wrongful execution (as we saw above, Acts 4:25-27).¹²⁵

¹²¹ Ibid., 161 in accordance with his methodology, states that Herod's role in this passage is to guide the characterisation of John with Herod serving as a foil.

¹²² Carroll, *Luke*, 205.

¹²³ Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 330.

¹²⁴ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 183.

¹²⁵ Omerzu, 'Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,' 131.

‘Herod’ and Jesus

Growing Antagonism: Luke 9:7-9 and 13:31-35

Context of Luke 9:7-9

This passage occurs near the culmination of the Galilean period of Jesus’ ministry (Luke 4:14—9:50). This section of the narrative focuses on Jesus’ teachings, miracles, and calling disciples,¹²⁶ actions which Jesus accomplishes in the power of the Spirit (Luke 4:14-15; cf. 3:21-22).¹²⁷ In addition to these foci, the opposition toward Jesus’ ministry that was prefigured in the temptation narrative (Luke 4:1-13) manifests itself through the presence of evil spirits, which are at work behind various illnesses (cf. Luke 4:33-36; 8:26-39) and human opposition to Jesus (Luke 4:28-29) and his disciples (Luke 9:5).¹²⁸

As we examine Luke’s depiction of ‘Herod’ in this section, we are reminded of what Darr notes in *Herod the Fox*, namely that his own work on Herod Antipas was prompted by a question posed by Fitzmyer in his essay on the composition of Luke 9 in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*.¹²⁹ Fitzmyer ponders ‘why Herod is made to ask the crucial question’ concerning Jesus’ identity.¹³⁰ Fitzmyer continues, stating that the answer to that question would provide the key to understanding Herod’s role in

¹²⁶ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 77 points to the repetition of key words found in the programmatic statement at Luke 4:16-44 in the summary statements at 5:17; 6:18; 9:11 as evidence of Luke’s emphasis on Jesus’ teaching and healings in this section. Also Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 198–199; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 54.

¹²⁷ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 522; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 54.

¹²⁸ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 198.

¹²⁹ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, ‘The Composition of Luke, Chapter 9,’ in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. by Charles H. Talbert (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978), 139–152. See Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 11–12.

¹³⁰ Fitzmyer, ‘Composition,’ 151.

the whole of Luke-Acts.¹³¹ As we have discussed above, our approach differs from Darr's, but we agree that 'Herod's' question at Luke 9:9 is an important factor in the narrative development. As we will see below, the same themes that develop in this section, particularly regarding Jesus' teaching and healing, are the reason behind 'Herod's' perplexity concerning Jesus and his desire to see Jesus. While it is tempting to view 'Herod's' inquisitive desire to see Jesus sympathetically, when we consider this text in light of the narrative as a whole, several details emerge which further contribute to the consistently antagonistic characterisation of 'Herod'.¹³² 'Herod's' rhetorical inquiry, τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος,¹³³ coupled with his desire to see Jesus (9:9), prepares for Luke 13:31-35, a story in which a group of Pharisees informs Jesus of 'Herod's' desire to kill him. Both of these passages anticipate the confrontation between Jesus and 'Herod' at 23:6-12.¹³⁴

'Herod' Sought to See Him

This brief pericope (Luke 9:7-9) appears 'Herod' in the midst of the story of Jesus' commissioning of his disciples for a localised preaching and healing

¹³¹ Ibid. This is the lacuna that Darr, *Herod the Fox* seeks to fill.

¹³² Bovon, *Luke 1*, 349–351 is somewhat unclear at this point. In his comments he claims that Herod's questioning is a step toward responding rightly to the gospel as proclaimed by Jesus and that Herod is not condemned *ipso facto*. In light of all the other evidence concerning Herod in Luke-Acts, it is difficult to agree with either of those assertions. Bovon does, however, summarise his comments on this passage by stating that Luke's overall assessment of Herod is negative. Concerning 'Herod's' antagonism, we also recall Luke's placing blame for John's death squarely on 'Herod' (Luke 9:9).

¹³³ Cf. Luke 5:21; 7:49; 8:25. In the first two instances, Pharisees are asking about Jesus' authority to forgive sins. At 8:25, the disciples inquire about Jesus' identity after his calming of the storm.

¹³⁴ Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 338; Johnson, *Luke*, 146; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 430; Marshall, *Luke*, 355. Several scholars note how the interconnectedness of these three passages give the narrative of Jesus and Herod a sense of coherence, e.g., Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 171; Tim Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*, SNTSMS 14 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 128; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 820.

expedition (Luke 9:1-10). With the disciples off on their initial mission, Jesus alone is the focus of ‘Herod’s’ perplexity. ‘Herod’ ἤκουσεν...τὰ γινόμενα πάντα καὶ διηπόρει. Διαπορέω is an exclusively Lukan term that describes puzzled responses to miraculous activity.¹³⁵ It appears that the source of ‘Herod’s’ puzzlement is Jesus’ miraculous activity and his teaching ministry,¹³⁶ which ‘Herod’ has heard about from people who have attributed them to a John the Baptist *redivivus*, the (re)appearance of Elijah, or one of the prophets of old who had been raised from the dead.¹³⁷

‘Herod’s’ response to these reports subtly indicates that ‘Herod’ does not believe what people are telling him. An adversative δέ (Luke 9:9) draws a contrast between John the Baptist and the one about whom ‘Herod’ hears such things. ‘Herod’s’ statement precludes his belief in any notion of John’s or a prophet’s resurrection as well as the appearance of Elijah.¹³⁸ For ‘Herod’, the resurrection of John the Baptist is impossible; he has beheaded John. Naturally, disbelief in

¹³⁵ Only here and Acts 2:12; 5:24; 10:17 (and the textual variant at Luke 24:4). Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, 116; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 397; Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 115. Additionally, Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 164–165 correctly states that this term provides a ‘rare inner view’ of Herod, but he reads too much into the term when he adds that it connotes more than perplexity. Fitzmyer, ‘Composition,’ 142 states that Luke omits any reference to Jesus’ miracles, but the Lukan usage of this term seems to imply that miraculous activity is the root of Herod’s bewilderment. Later, Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 758 concludes that Jesus’ preaching and healing are in view here.

¹³⁶ Marshall, *Luke*, 355; Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 164; Carroll, *Luke*, 205. Some believe that Herod has heard of the missionary work of the disciples (Luke 9:1-6) as well, e.g., Fitzmyer, ‘Composition,’ 142; Bovon, *Luke I*, 348; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 431; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 820, 822; Plummer, *St. Luke*, 240–241. Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 356, 361 believes that the apostolic mission is the exclusive cause of Herod’s perplexity, stating that Luke 9:1-6, 10 is a ‘co-textual constraint on how we are to understand the nature of what Herod has heard,’ while only allowing as an unlikely possibility that Herod heard of the work of Jesus. Actually, ‘Herod’s’ question, τίς δέ ἐστιν οὗτος, provides the necessary constraints on how we understand the ruler’s perplexity as the singular pronoun refers exclusively to Jesus (cf. Luke 5:21; 7:49; 8:25).

¹³⁷ The phrase διὰ τὸ λέγασθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν indicates that the reports made to ‘Herod’ are the *cause* of the ruler’s perplexity. So Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 758–759; Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff*, 128; Plummer, *St. Luke*, 241.

¹³⁸ As Conzelmann, *Theology*, 51 writes, ‘Any thought of precursors and of the return of figures from the past is excluded.’ On this point, also see Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 433; Marshall, *Luke*, 357. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 189 believes that Herod’s views on the resurrection are Sadducean, but this is speculation.

resurrection is a negative character trait (cf. Luke 18:34; 20:27-40; Acts 17:32).

‘Herod’ does not believe the reports and remains in a state of perplexity concerning Jesus asking rhetorically, τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος περὶ οὗ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα;

When viewed in light of the whole of Luke-Acts, this question serves to heighten the tension between ‘Herod’ and Jesus. Darr rightly states that Herod’s question focuses attention on the central concerns of the narrative, i.e., the life and death of Jesus.¹³⁹ ‘Herod’s’ question (and desire to see Jesus) proleptically looks to his desire to kill Jesus (Luke 13:31) as well as the ruler’s role in the Lukan passion narrative (Luke 23:6-12).¹⁴⁰ In further anticipation of the passion narrative, ‘Herod’ seeks to see Jesus (ἐξήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν). The verbal links provided by the recurrence of the terms ἀκούω, ζητέω (and the synonymous θέλω), εἶδον in Luke 9:7-9 and 23:8 illuminate what ‘Herod’ wanted to see.¹⁴¹ Both Luke 9:7-9 and 23:8 record ‘Herod’s’ having heard about Jesus (ἤκουσεν, 9:7; διὰ τὸ ἀκούειν περὶ αὐτοῦ, 23:8) and desiring to see him (ἐξήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν, 9:9; ἦν γὰρ ἐξ ἱκανῶν χρόνων θέλων ἰδεῖν, 23:8). Then, at Luke 23:8, ‘Herod’ ἤλπιζεν τι σημεῖον ἰδεῖν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ γινόμενον. For now, suffice it to say that ‘Herod’s’ desire to see Jesus perform a sign is depicted as a misguided desire since only an evil generation seeks such things (cf. Luke 11:16, 29-30).¹⁴² However, we cannot ignore the information provided at Luke 13:31

¹³⁹ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 168.

¹⁴⁰ Carroll, *Luke*, 205.

¹⁴¹ Bovon, *Luke 1*, 349 correctly states that Luke 23:6-12 ‘is a key to the interpretation of this pericope’ (Luke 9:7-9). See also Omerzu, ‘Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,’ 125.

¹⁴² I will elaborate on this in the exegesis of Luke 23:6-12 below. See Bovon, *Luke 1*, 349. Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, SBLMS 20 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), 26–27 states that Luke composes 23:8 so as to parallel 9:9.

concerning ‘Herod’s’ other motive for seeing Jesus.¹⁴³ In that passage a group of Pharisees tell Jesus that Ἡρώδης θέλει σε ἀποκτεῖναι.¹⁴⁴ The fact that one passage relates ‘Herod’s’ desire to kill Jesus and a later passage tells of his desire to see a miracle does not mean the desires are incompatible. As far as the narrative is concerned, ‘Herod’ desires both. To make a clear distinction between ‘Herod’s’ desires ignores the interconnectedness of these three passages and the implication of ‘Herod’ in the death of Jesus at Acts 4:25-27.¹⁴⁵

Further highlighting ‘Herod’s’ disingenuous desires is a narrative contrast with those of Zacchaeus, the only other character in the Lukan narrative who actively ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν (Luke 19:3). Though the narrative contains almost none of the interaction between Jesus and Zacchaeus, when the chief tax collector shows generosity toward the poor and rights the wrong he has done to people (19:8), there is little doubt that he casts Zacchaeus as one who seeks to see Jesus (and does so) rightly.¹⁴⁶ Zacchaeus sought to see Jesus and did; the result was repentance and

¹⁴³ Robert F. O’Toole, ‘Luke’s Message in Luke 9:1-50,’ *CBQ* 49 (1987): 83. Conzelmann, *Theology*, 51 points out that while Luke 9:7-9 prepares for the passion narrative, 13:31 is the immediate referent. While noting the connection between 9:9 and 13:31ff., D. A. S. Ravens, ‘Luke 9:7-62 and the Prophetic Role of Jesus,’ *NTS* 36 (1990): 122 states that Luke’s omission of a narrative account of John the Baptist’s death leaves Jesus’ death as the most important prophetic death for Luke (cf. 13:33).

¹⁴⁴ The potential motives of the Pharisees and ‘Herod’ will be noted below in the discussion of this text. However, the motives behind the text are ultimately of secondary import for my purposes here which is to deal with the explicit statements in the text itself.

¹⁴⁵ So Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 360–361 who brings the Herod narratives together and notes that the ruler is part of the plot to kill Jesus (Luke 13:31; 23:7-11; Acts 4:27). Bovon, *Luke 1*, 349 draws too fine a distinction between the desires expressed in 13:31 and 23:6-12. Evans, *Luke*, 141 is better, but still not strong enough when he writes, ‘Herod wanted to see Jesus (perhaps to kill him, 13:31), which he eventually will be able to do (see 23:8).’

¹⁴⁶ Zacchaeus is contrasted also with those who do not give to the poor in the third gospel, the rich man in one of Jesus’ parables (16:19-31) and the rich ruler (18:18-25). Also, Zacchaeus offers four-fold repayment to those he has extorted (ἐσυκοφάντησα, Luke 19:8). The only other Lukan usage of συκοφάντῳ is in John the Baptist’s message to soldiers inquiring what they should do as a response to John’s message of repentance (3:14).

Jesus' declaration that Zacchaeus is a son of Abraham. On the contrary, 'Herod' sought to see Jesus and did; the result was Jesus' death.

Such an outcome is only possible because of 'Herod's' ignorance of who Jesus is and the diabolical nature of his opposition. First, 'Herod's' ignorance concerning who Jesus is obvious in Luke 9:7-9 as demonstrated by the question τίς δέ ἐστιν οὗτος περὶ οὗ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα; There are three other instances in Luke-Acts of characters asking the question τίς ἐστιν οὗτος about Jesus (Luke 5:21; 7:49; 8:25).¹⁴⁷ In the first two cases, the Pharisees are antagonistic toward Jesus as they ask this question in response to Jesus forgiving sins.¹⁴⁸ In the third instance, the question betrays the lack of faith among Jesus' disciples when they raise the question after the calming of the storm at sea (Luke 8:22-25). The question is not inherently antagonistic. Instead it betrays the inquirer's ignorance concerning Jesus' identity and works. Different circumstances gave rise to 'Herod's' question, but even in a best-case scenario, the question would only serve to highlight the ruler's own bewilderment because of the miracles he has heard about and his lack of faith (as it does for Jesus' disciples). However, in light of the characterisation of 'Herod', the question serves to heighten the tension between him and Jesus, especially his having killed John the Baptist, his desire to kill Jesus, and his role in the Passion narrative.

¹⁴⁷ Fitzmyer, 'Composition,' 143; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 759; O'Toole, 'Luke's Message,' 78 note that these passages foreshadow Herod's question.

¹⁴⁸ At Luke 5:21 the Pharisees accuse Jesus of blasphemy. At 7:49, the context indicates that Simon the Pharisee is unaware of Jesus' true nature. While the Pharisees are not portrayed in an entirely negative light in Luke-Acts (Luke 13:31; Acts 5:34) and some even become believers (Acts 15:5), they are generally characterised as enemies of Jesus. In this instance, since the Pharisees are typically cast as opponents of Jesus (see below on Luke 13:31-35), their antagonism is inherent in the question.

Second, as we noted above, Green has argued that the opposition Jesus faces during the Galilean period of his ministry was foreshadowed in the temptation narrative and arises from demonic forces.¹⁴⁹ We have also noted above that Luke depicts the devil as holding authority over the kingdoms of the world, one of which ‘Herod’ rules.¹⁵⁰ Though ‘Herod’s’ opposition is not explicit in this context, we have shown that this text looks toward passages that do (Luke 13:31; 23:6-12). ‘Herod’s’ latent hostility in this context may be understood in light of Green’s observation concerning the Galilean ministry as a whole and comports well with our understanding that ‘Herod’ rules under the authority of the devil who opposes Jesus.

Luke 9:7-9 confirms Luke’s depiction of ‘Herod’ as it is summarised at Acts 4:25-27.¹⁵¹ ‘Herod’s’ stand against the Lord and his anointed begins with his opposition toward John, whom he imprisoned and eventually beheaded. ‘Herod’ now turns his attention to the miracle worker about whom people are talking. As Tannehill states,

Since Herod has already demonstrated how he treats meddlesome prophets, his interest in this new prophet, whom some even regard as John returned, suggests a threat to Jesus.¹⁵²

Similarly, Green writes, ‘...the prospect of official hostility to Jesus and his apostles raises its head’, and ‘Against this narrative sweep, it is difficult to regard [Herod’s]

¹⁴⁹ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 198.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Luke 4:5-6 and see above on Luke 1:5.

¹⁵¹ So Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 360 who states that Herod’s character and reputation are known to Luke’s readers. He adds a reminder of Luke 1:52-53 where rulers in general are assessed negatively.

¹⁵² Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 196. See also Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 356–357 who adds that Herod’s beheading John raises the spectre of similar opposition. For the reasons outlined here, I must disagree with Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 170, n.88 who states, ‘Despite its ominous overtones, this passage gives no explicit indication of hostility by Herod toward Jesus.’ Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 191, like Darr, believes that Herod seeks to see Jesus out of curiosity, not to harm him.

intrusion into the present as anything but menacing.¹⁵³ In this way, Luke 9:7-9 is not only the resolution of 'Herod's' conflict with John, it prepares for the ensuing confrontation between Jesus and 'Herod'.¹⁵⁴

Context of Luke 13:31-35

Luke 13:31-35 falls within the Lukan journey narrative (9:51—19:27), a section which portrays Jesus as moving toward his crucifixion and resurrection in Jerusalem (cf. Luke 9:51). The first two passion predictions in Luke 9:21-22, 43-45 have prepared for this journey. The present passage, though not a passion prediction *per se*,¹⁵⁵ focuses attention on the fate that will befall Jesus in Jerusalem by foreshadowing the crucifixion and resurrection in Jesus' response to the Pharisees who have confronted him with news of 'Herod's' desire to kill him. Specifically in this instance, the Lukan Jesus is aware that he still has work to do and that he will not die outside of Jerusalem (13:32-33).¹⁵⁶ Jesus' lament over Jerusalem is here, the conclusion of which clearly foreshadows the triumphal entry (13:35; 19:38).¹⁵⁷ The

¹⁵³ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 357, 361. Cf. also Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 178, though Ibid., 22 states that Herod's desire to see Jesus is not an expression of hostility.

¹⁵⁴ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 168–169; Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 178; R. Alan Culpepper, 'Luke,' *NIB* IX, 195. O'Toole, 'Luke's Message,' 85 believes the foreshadowing of Herod's hostility here also looks to Acts 12, 25-26.

¹⁵⁵ However, see Joseph B. Tyson, 'Jesus and Herod Antipas,' *JBL* 79 (1960): 245; Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 1430, both of whom see this passage referring to Jesus' violent death.

¹⁵⁶ There is no direct route to Jerusalem for Jesus (see Luke 9:51ff; 17:11). Instead, as Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 174 notes, place names in the travel narrative serve a symbolic and theological purpose.

¹⁵⁷ See Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 154; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1037. David L. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 73 sees 19:28-44 as the resolution of the tension presented in 13:31-35. Oddly, Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 168, citing Acts 3:17-21, understands this as referring to the parousia. The insistence of Marshall, *Luke*, 577, is also odd, as he argues that this is not a reference to the triumphal entry but rather points to the final consummation and the fulfilment of the promise of the coming Messiah.

Lukan Jesus is fully aware of the consequences of his journey to Jerusalem, as the prior passion predictions have shown and this passage makes clear.¹⁵⁸ In sum, this passage points to the climax of his story: Jesus must go to Jerusalem, die there, and be raised on the third day.¹⁵⁹

Though ‘Herod’ is not present in this scene as he was at Luke 9:7-9, the passage reveals important information about the ruler here. A group of Pharisees come to Jesus with the message that ‘Herod’ wants to kill him. Jesus’ response to the Pharisees offers the most explicit assessment of ‘Herod’ in the narrative yet – the king and ruler is a conniving, destructive, yet powerless, fox who cannot stop the work of Jesus until it is finished in Jerusalem.¹⁶⁰

‘Herod’ Wishes to Kill Him

This pericope begins with a group of Pharisees warning Jesus to leave the region because ‘Herod’ wants to kill him.¹⁶¹ ‘Herod’s’ hostility toward Jesus has already been foreshadowed; now he makes it explicit. This passage continues in the same narrative direction in the story of ‘Herod’ and Jesus that began with ‘Herod’s’

¹⁵⁸ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 174.

¹⁵⁹ Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 52 sees 13:31-33 and 13:34-35 as forming the centre of his chiasmic arrangement of the travel narrative. Also, Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 174 states that 13:31-35 is the heart of the journey narrative.

¹⁶⁰ Christopher Bryan, *Render to Caesar: Jesus, the Early Church, and the Roman Superpower* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 50; Richard J Cassidy, *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke’s Gospel* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1978), 51.

¹⁶¹ Scholars note that the phrase ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ links this passage directly to 13:22-30, e.g., Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 153; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1030; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 1246; Marshall, *Luke*, 124, 570; John Nolland, *Luke 9:21--18:34*, WBC 35b (Waco: Word, 1993), 740; Plummer, *St. Luke*, 348. Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 534–535 makes the interpretive link between the two passages explicit. He argues that Luke 13:22-30 contrasts those who strive for the narrow door with those who work unrighteousness. Herod and the Pharisees fall into the latter category.

imprisonment and execution of John as well as the ruler's desire to see Jesus.¹⁶² This direction will culminate in Jesus' trial before 'Herod' (Luke 23:6-12) and the implication of 'Herod' in Jesus' death (Acts 4:24-28).¹⁶³

In the narrative, 'Herod's' threat is real.¹⁶⁴ The ruler has already killed one prophet, John, and Jesus' response to the Pharisees indicates that he takes 'Herod's' threat seriously.¹⁶⁵ This is evident when we consider that Jesus' immediate response is to discuss his impending death, describing himself as a prophet who will suffer a fate similar to John's (Luke 13:32-35).¹⁶⁶ Several features of Jesus' statement bear this out. The terms ἀποκτείνω (cf. Luke 9:22; 18:33; 20:14-15; Acts 3:15; 7:52) and ἀπόλυμι (cf. Luke 19:47) in this passage, particularly the former, make it clear that Jesus is speaking of his impending death as these words appear in the Lukan passion predictions (Luke 9:22; 18:33) and other references to Jesus' death (including one instance that implicates the Pharisees in the deaths of apostles and prophets, Luke 11:47-49; cf. Acts 3:15). Additionally, the double reference to three days (Luke 13:32-33), and specifically the term τρίτος (cf. Luke 9:22; 18:33; 24:7, 21, 46; Acts

¹⁶² Lamar Cope, 'The Death of John the Baptist in The Gospel of Matthew; or The Case of the Confusing Conjunction,' *CBQ* 38 (1974): 518 believes that Jesus has inherited Herod's hostility toward John.

¹⁶³ As Johnson, *Luke*, 221 states, repeated references to Jerusalem in this context offers a strong reminder of the 'king of the earth' who plays a role in Jesus' death at Jerusalem.

¹⁶⁴ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 177.

¹⁶⁵ Conzelmann, *Theology*, 139; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 535; Marshall, *Luke*, 571; Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 495; Brown, *Death*, 1:770; Cassidy, *Jesus, Politics, and Society*, 51; Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 192; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1246 all rightly argue that the threat here must be read in light of Herod's execution of John the Baptist and thus perceived by Jesus as real. Others do not understand 13:31 in this way, e.g., Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 220; Adelbert Denaux, 'L'hypocrisie des Pharisiens et le Dessein de Dieu. Analyse de Lc., XIII, 31-33,' in *L'Évangile de Luc / The Gospel of Luke*, ed. Frans Neirynck, rev. and enlarged ed., BETL 32 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989), 173-174.

¹⁶⁶ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 153; Carroll, *Luke*, 293.

10:40), point toward Jesus' death and resurrection.¹⁶⁷ So, while 'Herod's' threat is real and 'Herod's' plays a role in Jesus' death (Acts 4:27; cf. Luke 23:6-12), this death will not take place before Jesus arrives in Jerusalem.¹⁶⁸

Jesus' response to the Pharisees includes a statement that is of utmost importance for the characterisation of 'Herod' since it is the only explicit statement made by Jesus *about* the ruler in the narrative.¹⁶⁹ 'Herod' is a 'fox'. It is difficult to determine the exact nuance of ἀλώπηξ here.¹⁷⁰ From ancient times the word 'fox' has been employed primarily as a derogatory, metaphorical epithet to describe cunning, malicious, destructive people.¹⁷¹ Two additional factors help us determine the

¹⁶⁷ So Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 168. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 154 draws an unnecessary distinction when he sees the three days as referring to Jesus' journey and only in a secondary manner to his death. Of course, the three days refer to both.

¹⁶⁸ Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1029; Carroll, *Luke*, 294.

¹⁶⁹ The remainder of Jesus' response to the Pharisees warrants a brief examination here. I view 13:32 and 13:33 as parallel statements that have slightly different emphases (with Marshall, *Luke*, 569, 572-573). 13:32 focuses on the work of Jesus, which has drawn the ire of 'Herod'. This work will continue despite 'Herod's' intent to kill Jesus and is completed (τελειοῦμαι) at the crucifixion. 13:33 does not represent a contrast to 13:32, since πλὴν may serve as a connective (Luke 10:11, 20; 17:1; 18:8; 22:22; Acts 15:28; Marshall, *Luke*, 572). However, 13:33 shifts the focus from Jesus' work to the divine necessity of his journey (δεῖ...πορεύσθαι; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 535) with τῇ ἐχομένῃ replacing τῇ τρίτῃ (Plummer, *St. Luke*, 350), but carrying a similar symbolic meaning (Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 193 wrongly questions the existence of resurrection typology here). Both the work and journey of Jesus end in Jerusalem with his death. In addition to preparing for the triumphal entry (13:35; cf. 19:28-38), there may be several other reasons why Luke has placed this story here: the word Ἱερουσαλήμ contrasts Jesus' desire for Jerusalem with the city's opposition (in which 'Herod' participates), and prepares for Jesus' predictions of Jerusalem's impending destruction (cf. 19:41-44; 21:20-24; ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν may refer either to the Temple proper as in Luke 6:4; 11:51; 19:46; Acts 7:47, 49 or it may carry a metaphorical meaning as a reference to the city and its inhabitants [see Acts 2:36; 7:42, 46 and Francis D. Weinart, 'Luke, the Temple and Jesus' Saying About Jerusalem's Abandoned House (Luke 13:34-35),' *CBQ* 44 (1982): 68-76 who lays out the alternative views]. In any event, I believe Luke is referring to the events of 70 CE. See Tannehill *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 156 on the narrative connections between 13:35; 19:41-44; 21:20-24; 23:27-41).

¹⁷⁰ We can easily dismiss the suggestion of L. H. Bunn, 'Herod Antipas and "That Fox",' *ExpT* 43 (1931): 381, who believes that 'fox' does not fit the depiction of Herod, but refers instead to Caiaphas or Annas.

¹⁷¹ See BDAG, 49. The lexical data for ἀλώπηξ is scant and, as such, not very helpful. There are several LXX occurrences (Judg 1:35; 15:4; 3 Kgdms 20:10; Psalms 62:11; Song 2:15; Lam 5:18; Ezek 13:4) and in classical literature contemporaneous to Luke-Acts. See Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 180. Randall Buth, 'That Small-fry Herod Antipas, or When a Fox Is Not a Fox,' *Jerusalem Perspective Online* (January 1, 2004) notes some exceptions in early Rabbinic literature and argues that it is used here to belittle Herod by contrasting him with a lion. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas* Appendix XI (pp. 343-347) has a summary of LXX and Classical Greek usage (see also LSJ, 75).

meaning of ἀλώπηξ: 1) the characterisation of ‘Herod’ elsewhere in the narrative and 2) the portrayal of the messengers, the Pharisees, in Luke-Acts. The characterisation of ‘Herod’ outside this pericope confirms that the ruler is a destructive force in the narrative and that this is in view when he refers to the ruler as ἀλώπηξ in Luke 13:32.¹⁷² ‘Herod’ is a representative political opponent of Jesus (Acts 4:25-27)¹⁷³ and an evil-doer who imprisoned and beheaded John (3:19-20; 9:9). Moreover, in our present context, Jesus understands ‘Herod’s’ threat as legitimate, which prompts Jesus’ immediate response regarding his impending death in Jerusalem. If we understand ‘fox’ to mean cunning, malicious, and destructive, the descriptor fits ‘Herod’ perfectly.¹⁷⁴

Second, as we have seen with Luke’s connection of ‘Herod’ to other hostile characters above, the presence of Pharisees as ‘Herod’s’ messengers in this pericope bears out the negative assessment of ‘Herod’ we have seen thus far.¹⁷⁵ For the third evangelist the Pharisees are not the quintessential enemies of Jesus that they are in

¹⁷² Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 180–181.

¹⁷³ In his comments on Luke 9:1-17, Johnson, *Luke*, 148 rightly states that Herod represents the powers that want to kill Jesus.

¹⁷⁴ Marshall, *Luke*, 570; Nolland, *Luke 9:21--18:34*, 740; Carroll, *Luke*, 294; F. A. Farley, ‘A Text (Luke Xiii.33),’ *ExpT* 34 (1922): 430. Scholars underscore different nuances of ἀλώπηξ. For the reasons outlined above, Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 182; Brown, *Death*, 1:770; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1247; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 166 emphasise Herod’s destructiveness. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1029, 1031 emphasises Herod’s craftiness. T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1949), 276; Evans, *Luke*, 216; Marshall, *Luke*, 571 see both insignificance and cunning in the portrayal of Herod. Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 536 sees no note of craftiness or cunning. Instead, he believes ‘fox’ connotes a lack of status and Herod’s inability to carry out his threat. J. Duncan M. Derrett, ‘Herod’s Oath and the Baptist’s Head,’ *BZ* 9 (1965): 240 understands ‘fox’ as a ‘miserable, low-spirited, worthless creature’, and sees no connotation of craftiness. In light of the lack of lexical data and Herod’s depiction elsewhere in Luke-Acts, there does not seem to be a very good reason to discount the ‘normal’ meaning of ἀλώπηξ as describing a crafty/cunning, destructive person.

¹⁷⁵ Strangely, Marshall, *Luke*, 570 states that Luke’s overall depiction of the Pharisees is not helpful here.

the other two synoptic gospels, particularly Matthew.¹⁷⁶ The absence of explicit reference to the Pharisees in the Lukan Jerusalem and passion narratives is particularly striking.¹⁷⁷ Further, in Acts 5:17-42, Gamaliel urges his fellow council members (a number of whom are Pharisees) to proceed with caution in apprehending the apostles. Some Pharisees even become part of the Jerusalem church (Acts 15:5). Also, Paul, one of Luke's protagonists, is a Pharisee (Acts 23:6; 26:5) and in the scene at Acts 23:1-10 the Pharisees come to Paul's defence because he claims to be on trial for professing the resurrection of the dead.¹⁷⁸ Nevertheless, while there are several Pharisees in Luke-Acts depicted in a positive light, they are sometimes shown to be among John the Baptist's and Jesus' enemies.¹⁷⁹ Thus, Pharisees have rejected God's purposes by not accepting the baptism of John (Luke 7:30) and they are lovers of money (Luke 16:14). Pharisees grumble against Jesus and question him when they disagree with his pronouncements and actions (Luke 5:17, 21, 30, 33; 6:2, 7; 14:1-5; 15:2; 16:14; 17:20; 19:39; cf. Luke 11:37-44; 12:1; 18:9-14).¹⁸⁰ As a result, they seek to trap Jesus in what he says, presumably to arrest him or charge him with a crime (Luke 11:53-54). Since many of Jesus' interactions with the

¹⁷⁶ Francois Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 9,51-14,35)*, EKK 3.2 (Zurich: Benziger, 1996), 448; Alexandru Neagoe, *The Trial of the Gospel: An Apologetic Reading of Luke's Trial Narrative*, SNTSMS 116 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 37-38.

¹⁷⁷ Cassidy, *Jesus, Politics, and Society*, 52; Neagoe, *Trial of the Gospel*, 48. This stands in contrast to Mark 12:13 and especially Matt 22:14, 34, 41; 27:62. However, the Pharisees are often linked to the scribes (Luke 5:21, 30; 6:7; 11:53; 15:2) and some of the scribes are identified as belonging to the Pharisees (Acts 23:9). So, perhaps when the scribes participate in Jesus' trial, we could conclude that some of them are Pharisees as well (Luke 22:2, 66; 23:10). On the scribes among the Pharisees, see Brown, *Death*, 2:1427, 1431.

¹⁷⁸ As Robert C. Tannehill, 'The Narrator's Strategy in the Scenes of Paul's Defense,' *Forum* 8 (1992): 260 states, the reaction of the Pharisees in Acts 23:1-10 show that they are not hardened opponents.

¹⁷⁹ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 179.

¹⁸⁰ Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 495. Luke 11:45 indicates that the rebukes were intended for and heard by all present.

Pharisees fall within the journey narrative, those passages will be most enlightening when discerning their depiction here and their relation to ‘Herod’.¹⁸¹ A particularly enlightening text is Luke 11:37—12:1, a story in which Jesus speaks directly against the Pharisees and scribes, condemning them for their prideful attitudes (Luke 11:37-44) and implicating them in the deaths of the prophets (Luke 11:45-52, a passage that foreshadows Luke 13:32-35). This interchange prompts explicit opposition toward Jesus (11:53-54), which they express in their rejection of Jesus’ teachings (Luke 14:1; 15:2; 16:14; 19:39) in the remainder of the journey narrative. Immediately following the exchange at Luke 11:37-54, Jesus warns his disciples to watch out for the hypocrisy of the Pharisees (Luke 12:1). These passages inform how we should view the Pharisees at Luke 13:31.¹⁸² They are hypocrites who reject the teaching of Jesus because they do not know who he truly is.¹⁸³ Therefore, Johnson correctly asks, ‘Why should we read their statement [at Luke 13:31] as beneficent toward Jesus?’¹⁸⁴ Their hostility does not negate the truthfulness of the report,¹⁸⁵ which, as we have

¹⁸¹ So Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 178–179; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 181.

¹⁸² Denaux, ‘L’hypocrisie des Pharisiens,’ 172.

¹⁸³ Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 495.

¹⁸⁴ Johnson, *Luke*, 217, 220–221 identifies the Pharisees as enemies of the prophets and Jesus (Luke 5:17, 21; 6:2, 7; 7:30, 36, 39; 11:38-39, 42-43) and notes their grudge against Jesus (Luke 11:53). He adds that to assume goodwill on the part of the Pharisees is to betray the basic rules of literary analysis; Denaux, ‘L’hypocrisie des Pharisiens,’ 171 also questions why scholars would view the Pharisees positively here given their depiction elsewhere in Luke’s works. On the contrary, and wrongly in my estimation, Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 537, and J. A. Ziesler, ‘Luke and the Pharisees,’ *NTS* 25 (1979): 146–157 by emphasising the more positive depictions of Pharisees in Luke-Acts, argue that there is no reason to view the Pharisees negatively here.

¹⁸⁵ Here we follow Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 175–176, who supposes that Herod’s threat is real and the duplicitous Pharisees are using it to get rid of Jesus. Also see John A. Darr, *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), chapter 4 (pp. 85–126, esp. 106). Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1246; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 538; Marshall, *Luke*, 570; Brown, *Death*, 1:770; Plummer, *St. Luke*, 348; Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 116, all agree on this point. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 214–220 disagrees on both points: he sees Herod’s threat as unreal and views this group of Pharisees as friendly toward Jesus who, nevertheless, want to move Jesus out of Galilee. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1029–1030 appears to agree with Hoehner on these points, but he is more concerned with the theological necessity of the journey to Jerusalem.

seen, Jesus believes to be true. Luke 13:31 is a case of the respective characterisations of ‘Herod’ and the Pharisees as mutually informing. These complementary characterisations demonstrate the hostility toward Jesus and the rejection of Jesus’ message embodied by both the Pharisees and ‘Herod’. Luke 13:31 portrays them as coordinating their efforts to rid themselves of Jesus.¹⁸⁶

Luke 13:31-35 reflects the depiction of ‘Herod’ that we have seen at Acts 4:25-27. He is a representative political ruler who directly opposes Jesus (and the Jesus movement) in Luke-Acts. As Acts 4:25-27 implicates ‘Herod’ in the death of Jesus, so Luke 13:31 makes the ruler’s desire to kill Jesus explicit.¹⁸⁷ Additionally, as in the prayer of the early Christians, those praying name the city of Jerusalem (ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, Acts 4:27) as the place of Jesus’ death. The threefold repetition of the word Ἱερουσαλήμ at Luke 13:33-34 echoes this (cf. Luke 9:31), further indicating that Jesus will suffer a fate like that of the prophets when he arrives in the city. Thus, at Luke 13:31, the depiction of ‘Herod’ is consistent with what we have seen of the ruler elsewhere. Before we turn to the passion narrative, in which we find ‘Herod’ in Jerusalem for the Passover, overseeing one of the trials of Jesus before the crucifixion, we will examine two passages that demonstrate ‘Herod’s’ rejection of Jesus’ message, Luke 8:3 and Acts 13:1.

¹⁸⁶ However, Jesus journeys to Jerusalem because of divine necessity (δεῖ, Luke 13:33), not because of the threat. See Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 153; Bovon, *Lukas (9,51-14,35)*, 449.

¹⁸⁷ Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1029 correctly states that Herod’s earlier curiosity (9:9) is now unmasked and will be explained later as Herod makes no attempt to save the innocent Jesus from the Jerusalem leaders and even participates in mocking Jesus. Also see Conzelmann, *Theology*, 139.

Context of Luke 8:3 and Acts 13:1

Luke 8:3 is part of the Galilean portion of Jesus' ministry which we discussed above. The important factor here is the immediate context of this passage, the parable of the soils (Luke 8:4-15). The emphasis in this parable on receiving and responding to the word of God appropriately provides reference points by which we may assess the depictions of various characters.¹⁸⁸ For 'Herod' specifically, his rejection of the message proclaimed by Jesus and his disciples corroborates the previous depiction of 'Herod' ruling under the authority of the devil (Luke 8:12; cf. 4:5-6 and above on Luke 1:5).¹⁸⁹

Acts 13:1 represents a turning point in the narrative of Luke-Acts from the primarily Jewish mission of the church to the story of the primarily Gentile mission carried out by Paul *et al.*¹⁹⁰ The story of 'Herod's' death anticipates this worldwide mission, stating that as a result of the ruler's death the word of God continued to grow and multiply (Acts 12:24), with Paul and Barnabas leaving Jerusalem to return to Antioch where they are commissioned for the task to which the Holy Spirit had called them.

These two passages add to what was clear at Luke 9:7-9, i.e., that 'Herod' had heard about Jesus. The message proclaimed by Jesus and his disciples had

¹⁸⁸ Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 97; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 146, 210.

¹⁸⁹ Darr capitalises on the juxtaposition of the parable of the soils and the naming of Herod in this context, making Herod's response to the message that John the Baptist and Jesus preach the paradigm for his understanding of Herod Antipas as a character. See his conclusions at Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 211–212.

¹⁹⁰ Johnson, *Acts*, 225; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 496.

evidently reached the highest levels of society with members of ‘Herod’s’ household becoming disciples of Jesus. Herein lies the contribution to the portrayal of ‘Herod’ in these texts: Jesus’ message has reached ‘Herod’s’ household and the ruler’s lingering antagonism is indicative of his rejection of that message. As Weaver states, ‘Manaen’s connection to the Herodian family is analogous to the identification of Joanna as the wife of a steward of Herod at Luke 8:3. That is, both descriptions portray the positive reception of Jesus and his followers among the ruling classes.’¹⁹¹

Joanna: A Disciple in the House of ‘Herod’

At Luke 8:3 we learn that ‘Herod’ has a man named Chuza in his employ and that Chuza’s wife, Joanna,¹⁹² is one of several women who have been healed by Jesus and subsequently became one of his disciples, helping to support Jesus and his other disciples with their own financial resources.¹⁹³ The precise meaning of ἐπιτρόπος is unclear leaving Chuza’s exact relationship to ‘Herod’ somewhat ambiguous. The word is a *hapax* in Luke-Acts, though the cognate ἐπιτροπῆς is found at Acts 26:12 referring to Paul’s commission from the chief priests to pursue

¹⁹¹ Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, 167, n. 210.

¹⁹² Kathleen E. Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus: Feminist Myths of Christian Origins* (Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2002), 31 states that ‘Joanna’ and ‘Susanna’ are names added by Luke. She claims that the names may have been used for literary purposes (but does not state what that purpose might be) or that the women may have been prominent members of the Lukan community.

¹⁹³ Ibid. does not believe that Luke’s comment about the women supporting Jesus and his followers betrays Luke’s bias in favour of the prominence of women in early Christianity and is not likely to be historical. On Joanna as a source of information for the author concerning Herod’s house see Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 162–163; Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 120; Ben Witherington III, *Women in the Ministry of Jesus: A Study of Jesus’ Attitudes to Women and Their Roles as Reflected in His Earthly Life*, SNTSMS 51 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 248. It is possible that Joanna provided the author with inside information on Herod’s house, but the issue is beyond the scope of our investigation.

Christians in Damascus.¹⁹⁴ At the very least, the term connotes delegated authority and that Chuza was a significant person who held a relatively prominent position in ‘Herod’s’ kingdom.¹⁹⁵ That this man’s wife is one of the numerous women who have been healed by Jesus¹⁹⁶ and subsequently ministered to Jesus and his disciples from their own resources (διηκόνουν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων¹⁹⁷ αὐταῖς)¹⁹⁸ indicates that the good news of the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus¹⁹⁹ had reached the

¹⁹⁴ The term occurs elsewhere in the NT at Matt 20:8; Gal 4:2 and in the LXX at 2 Macc 11:1; 13:2; 14:2.

¹⁹⁵ BDAG, 385 offers the definitions ‘manager, foreman, steward’, all of which connote the idea of delegated authority. At Luke 8:3 we can certainly rule out any high-ranking political connotations that the term has in 2 Macc or Josephus (*Ant.* 15.406; 17.221, 252; 18.158; 20.2). Chuza may have held a lower political office under ‘Herod’, he may have been a foreman over ‘Herod’s’ household workers, or in charge of the affairs of the house (see Matt 20:8). Scholars have made various proposals, coming to no consensus. I agree with Carroll, *Luke*, 183 who states that Chuza was a person of import and perhaps wealth. This best allows the narrative to speak for itself as it accounts for Chuza’s delegated authority and the financial means with which Joanna helps support Jesus and his disciples. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 303–304 believes that Chuza is in charge of Herod’s property and finances. Others agree with Hoehner, e.g., Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 109; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 366; Johnson, *Luke*, 131; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 301; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 698; Turid Karlsen Seim, *The Double Message* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 36; Witherington III, *Women in the Ministry of Jesus*, 246; Plummer, *St. Luke*, 216; David C. Sim, ‘The Woman Followers of Jesus: The Implications of Luke 8:1-3,’ *Heythrop Journal* 30 (1989): 54. Others, such as Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 321; Elisabeth Moltmann-Wendel, *The Women Around Jesus*, trans. John Bowden (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 133; Marshall, *Luke*, 317 leave the exact nuance of the term unspecified and understand it as an indication of Chuza and Joanna’s high status. Finally, Kathleen E. Corley, *Private Women, Public Meals* (Peabody: Hendricksen, 1993), 111, n.3 believes that Chuza was either a slave or a freedman and part of a somewhat privileged middle-class.

¹⁹⁶ As Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 318 states, the social stigma associated with sickness and/or demonization may have led to these women leaving their previous lives to join the travelling group around Jesus and possibly foreshadows Jesus’ call to realign one’s family allegiance (Luke 8:19-21; 9:57-62; 12:51-53; 14:25-35; 18:18-30).

¹⁹⁷ Marshall, *Luke*, 317 rightly concludes that this term indicates that these are women of financial means. Nolland, *Luke 1:1-9:20*, 367 notes that this passage falls within the Lukan emphasis on the utilisation of one’s personal means for the sake of the community (Luke 12:15-21, 33-34; 14:33; 16:9; 19:8; other passages in Acts). Seim, *Double Message*, 63–66 agrees with Marshall and Nolland. Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 320 is less sure and questions whether Joanna would have had access to her husband’s wealth. Sim, ‘Woman Followers,’ 52 flatly states that it is unlikely that Joanna was wealthy.

¹⁹⁸ On the textual variant here, I agree with Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 714 who states that the plural reading is correct as it is the more difficult reading. Serving Jesus is practically expected, to serve and support the wider group of disciples as well is not.

¹⁹⁹ The proclamation of the Kingdom of God is coupled with healings/exorcisms in other contexts as well (Luke 4:38-44; 9:1-2, 11; 10:9; 11:20; Acts 8:4-12). See Ruth Ann Foster and William D. Shiell, ‘The Parable of the Sower and the Seed,’ *RevExp* 94 (1997): 262.

ruler's own household.²⁰⁰ As the narrative unfolds, Joanna and the other women named here become part of the core group of Jesus' followers,²⁰¹ reappearing in the narratives of Jesus' resurrection.²⁰²

Following the pericope of the women supporters of Jesus is the parable of the sower and its explanation (Luke 8:4-15) thereby highlighting 'Herod's' non-receptivity to the word of God.²⁰³ In contrast to the powerful individuals who heard John's message (Luke 3:7-14) and others throughout the story who respond

²⁰⁰ Luke regularly shows Jesus and his followers making inroads with prominent members of society via their preaching, e.g., Levi (Luke 5:27-32), Jairus (Luke 8:41), Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1-10), Joseph of Arimathea (Luke 23:50), various centurions (Luke 7:1-10; Acts 10:1—11:17; 27:43), Pharisees (Acts 15:15), and other women (Acts 17:3, 12). See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 698; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 124; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 366–368; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 302; Abraham Malherbe, "Not in a Corner": Early Christian Apologetic in Acts 26:26,' *SecCent* 5 (86 1985): 196; Witherington III, *Women in the Ministry of Jesus*, 246; Jean-Marie van Cangh, 'La Femme dans l'Évangile de Luc,' *RTL* 24 (1993): 311. In contrast to the above, Seim, *Double Message*, 36 sees no significance in Luke's interest in the Herodian house and his interest in individuals of high social standing when he mentions Chuza here. Further, Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 321 does not see Joanna sharing in her husband's high social status. Instead, he understands her leaving her mixed past (married to a high-ranking individual but enduring the stigma of sickness and/or demon possession) for the kinship group formed around Jesus.

²⁰¹ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 317–320 notes that the participation by Jesus' travelling companions in the proclamation of the Kingdom does not come until 9:1-6; 10:1-11. Green also dispels any notion of sexual impropriety on the part of these women, appealing to Luke 7:36-50 and stating that all of the women involved exhibit 'gratitude and generosity'. Seim, *Double Message*, 39 adds that there is no indication that what these women were doing was controversial. E. P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1993), 110 points out that women regularly travelled with men *en route* to festivals, etc., but otherwise there may have been rumours of illicit behaviour. Perhaps it was scandalous for a woman to leave her husband and travel with a group of men as concluded by Moltmann-Wendel, *Women*, 134; Sim, 'Woman Followers,' 53; Ben Witherington III, 'On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and Other Disciples - Lk 8:1-3,' *ZNW* 70 (1979): 245, but in the narrative we should understand this as nothing more than their responses to Jesus' call of discipleship.

²⁰² See Luke 23:49; 24:10; Acts 1:14. As Johnson, *Luke*, 131, 134 indicates, Luke's mentioning the women here anticipates the role they will play later in the story. Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 161–162 adds that Luke 8:1-3 establishes the credibility of these women as they will play a role in the crucifixion and resurrection narratives. See also Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 305; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 93; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 210; Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 713; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 300; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 696, 698; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 47; Marshall, *Luke*, 315; Seim, *Double Message*, 28, 35, 148–151; van Cangh, 'La Femme,' 311; Witherington III, *Women in the Ministry of Jesus*, 246; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 122; Corley, *Private Women*, 112–113.

²⁰³ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 210 helpfully summarises Luke 8:4-18 as Jesus' commentary on what is happening in response to his proclamation. Seim, *Double Message*, 68 claims too much, asserting that Luke 8:4-18 outlines the criteria for membership in the new community.

positively to Jesus' message (including the women named in this passage),²⁰⁴ 'Herod' never responds rightly to the proclamation of the word. Bovon states that Joanna's decision to leave 'Herod's' court stands in contrast to 'the half-sympathy [of Herod] which turns from laxity and indecision into the opposition which forces the execution of Jesus.'²⁰⁵ Jesus' interpretation of the parable of the soils implies that the devil, who delegates authority to 'Herod', prevents the ruler from ever responding appropriately to Jesus (Luke 8:12).²⁰⁶ Joanna shows us that Jesus' message has reached the house of 'Herod', and moreover, that Jesus now draws a following and significant financial support from the ruler's house. The same is true of Manaen, another member of 'Herod's' household who becomes a prophet/teacher in the church at Antioch.

Manaen: A Disciple in the House of 'Herod'

As at Luke 8:3,²⁰⁷ Luke makes a similar passing reference to 'Herod' at Acts 13:1 while listing several of the prophet/teachers from the church at Antioch.²⁰⁸ One

²⁰⁴ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 320 states that these women are examples of those who 'hear and act on the word of God'. Also see Moltmann-Wendel, *Women*, 139.

²⁰⁵ Bovon, *Luke 1*, 301.

²⁰⁶ See above on Luke 1:5 (cf. Luke 4:5-6) and the next chapter.

²⁰⁷ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 208; Johnson, *Acts*, 221.

²⁰⁸ The simple linking of the terms προφήται and διδάσκαλοι with καί seems to indicate that Luke views the functions as overlapping in this instance. In other words, the five individuals listed here are both prophets *and* teachers at Antioch. The repetition of τε (Acts 13:1) does not divide the list into two groups. See David Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 265; Witherington III, *Acts*, 391; H. B. Swete, 'The Prophets in the Christian Church,' *BW* 26 (1905): 204, n. 11; Bock, *Acts*, 439; Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 602; Pervo, *Acts*, 318; Haenchen, *Acts*, 395. *Contra* Henry J. Cadbury and Kirsopp Lake, 'The Acts of the Apostles,' in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson, Kirsopp Lake, and Henry J. Cadbury, vol. IV (London: Macmillan and Co., 1933), 141.

prophet/teacher is Manaen, σύντροφος of ‘Herod’.²⁰⁹ Σύντροφος is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT, and like the term ἐπιτρόπος at Luke 8:3, we have no definitive way of understanding this term in Acts 13:1.²¹⁰ In any event, Manaen’s relationship to ‘Herod’ was significant enough to mention here.²¹¹ Manaen has come under the influence of the burgeoning Christian movement. Just as the message preached by John and Jesus had reached the ruler’s household, evidenced by Joanna following and supporting Jesus, here the early Christians have proclaimed the gospel within hearing of the ruler’s household. ‘Herod’s’ persecution of the church (Acts 12:1-6) demonstrates that he has rejected the message preached by the church. In contrast to ‘Herod’s’ rejection, Manaen prophesied and taught at the church in Antioch and was part of the group who commissioned Barnabas and Saul as itinerant preachers under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.²¹² The portrayal of Manaen as a prophet/teacher also

²⁰⁹ Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 231–232, 305 claims that Manaen is Luke’s source for this information. As noted above with regard to Joanna, this may be the case but the issue does not concern us here.

²¹⁰ Both Strabo and Plutarch use the term to refer to a foster brother, i.e., an adopted child brought up alongside a prince (see Strabo, *Geog.* 10.4; Plutarch, *Pom.* 42.3 and LSJ, 1729; BDAG, 976). The author of 2 Macc 9:29 uses the term with reference to Philip, a member of the court of Antiochus IV. Josephus refers to Hyrcanus as σύντροφος of Herod the Great (Jos. *War* 1.215; *Ant.* 14.183). Scholars have opted for both of these interpretations of the term at Acts 13:1. Gaventa, *Acts*, 190 does not decide and leaves the matter open. Edgar R. Smothers, ‘Chrysostom and Symeon (Acts XV, 14),’ *Harvard Theological Review* 46 (1953): 214 understand the term as meaning foster-brother. Those understanding the term as ‘childhood friend’ include Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 208; Johnson, *Acts*, 221; Bruce, *Acts*, 293; Cadbury and Lake, ‘The Acts of the Apostles,’ 142; Bock, *Acts*, 439; Parsons, *Acts*, 184; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 496–497. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 14, n. 2, 141 believes that Herod and Manaen were educated together. Others believe that Manaen was simply a close friend of Herod, including Witherington III, *Acts*, 392; Barrett, *Acts I–XIV*, 604; Haenchen, *Acts*, 395; Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 116; G. Adolf Deissmann, *Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity*, trans. Alexander Grieve, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1903), 312. Pervo, *Acts*, 322, n. 27 concludes that Manaen is a former associate of Herod and was in no way a social peer to the ruler. On this last point, see also Jerome H. Neyrey, ‘Luke’s Social Location of Paul: Cultural Anthropology and the Status of Paul in Acts,’ in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, ed. Ben Witherington III (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 262.

²¹¹ Bock, *Acts*, 439.

²¹² See Acts 13:2-3. Barrett, *Acts I–XIV*, 604. The terminology ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας is parallel to Acts 6:6, and just as that earlier scene prepares for the ensuing narrative of Stephen’s preaching, so this scene prepares for the preaching of Barnabas and Saul.

places him in the same company as several of those whom ‘Herod’ opposes, namely John the Baptist, who is a prophet, and Jesus, who is a prophet and teacher.²¹³ The conclusion here is similar to that deduced above concerning Joanna: a significant member of ‘Herod’s’ own household or court has responded rightly to the gospel while ‘Herod’ did not. The good news has been proclaimed within the ruler’s hearing and he has rejected it.

We have seen that ‘Herod’ is a king and ruler who stands against the Lord and his anointed (Acts 4:25-27), Jesus, who was born the true king (Luke 1:5, 32-33). Moreover, ‘Herod’ is an evil-doer who not only ignored the rebuke of God’s prophet, John, but imprisoned him as well (Luke 3:18-20). Luke makes ‘Herod’s’ evil nature obvious as he narrates the ruler’s execution of John (Luke 9:9) as well as his desire to see and kill Jesus (Luke 9:7-9; 13:31). This picture of ‘Herod’ looms in Luke 8:1-3; Acts 13:1, passages in which Luke subtly indicates that ‘Herod’ has rejected the gospel that Jesus and his followers proclaim.²¹⁴ The good news has come to the ruler’s own household and the ruler has rejected it.²¹⁵ ‘Herod’ and Jesus finally come face-to-face in the trial scenes of the passion narrative (Luke 23:6-12). Here we see ‘Herod’s’ hostility toward Jesus and his rejection of the gospel on display.

²¹³ On John and Jesus as προφήτης see Luke 1:76; 7:26, 39; 20:6 for John and Luke 4:24; 7:16; 13:33; 24:19; Acts 3:22-23; 7:37 for Jesus. On other uses of the term προφήτης see Luke 1:70; 3:4; 4:17; 9:8; 10:24; 24:25; Acts 2:16, 30; 3:22; 7:37; 8:28; 10:43; 13:15, 20; 15:15; 24:14 for references to OT prophets, Luke 16:16, 29, 31; 24:27, 44; Acts 28:23 for the prophets as Scripture, and Acts 11:27; 15:32; 21:10 for other Christian prophets. The verb προφητεύω is used with reference to Zechariah’s speech after the birth of John (Luke 1:67), Christians in general (Acts 2:17-18), converts in Ephesus (Acts 19:6), Philip’s daughters (Acts 21:9) as well as the ironic command by those mocking Jesus to prophesy (Luke 22:64). For Jesus as διδάσκαλος see Luke 3:12; 7:40; 8:49; 9:38; 10:25; 11:45; 12:13; 18:18; 19:39; 20:21, 28, 39; 21:7; 22:11. Διδάσκαλος only occurs here in Acts. The verb διδάσκω is used of both Jesus and the Spirit in the third gospel (Luke 4:15; 5:3; 6:6; 11:1; 12:12; 13:10; 19:47; cf. Acts 1:1) and of the apostles (Acts 4:2; 5:21), Saul/Paul (Acts 11:26; 18:11; 20:20; 28:31), and Paul and Barnabas (Acts 15:35) in Acts.

²¹⁴ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 162; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 321; Moltmann-Wendel, *Women*, 138–139.

²¹⁵ Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 714; Nolland, *Luke 1:1-9:20*, 367–368.

Though ‘Herod’ apparently agreed with Pilate’s ‘not guilty’ verdict concerning Jesus (Luke 23:15), we must remember that Luke implicates both ‘Herod’ and Pilate in Jesus’ death at Acts 4:25-27 and understand their involvement in Jesus’ passion in light of that passage.

An (Anti-)Climactic Meeting: Luke 23:6-12

Context of Jesus’ Trial Before ‘Herod’: The Culmination of Conflict and Christology

As Jesus’ death, resurrection, and ascension are the points around which the entire narrative revolves, the whole of the third gospel and Acts serves as the context of these passages.²¹⁶ Space does not permit such a thorough investigation here. Instead, I will use Jesus’ three passion predictions (Luke 9:21-22, 43-45; 18:31-34) as a means of focalising the issues that are resolved in the passion narrative, two in particular: conflict and Christology.²¹⁷

Two conflicts that have intensified throughout the Lukan narrative reach their climax in the passion narrative: the conflict between Jesus and the Jewish religious leaders and the conflict between Jesus and Satan.²¹⁸ The Lukan passion predictions speak of several groups coming together to put the Son of Man to death: elders,

²¹⁶ In accordance with the understanding of the unity of Luke-Acts and the narrative-critical methodology adopted in this thesis, I agree with Talbert, *Literary Themes*, 112 who states that Luke-Acts fits the tendency of both Greco-Roman and Jewish writings to have their ‘key point at the center’ of the writing. The entirety of the third gospel builds toward the Lukan passion, especially from 9:51, and the repetition of the ascension narrative in Luke 24 and Acts 1 serves as a pivot point for the whole of the narrative.

²¹⁷ I follow Neagoe, *Trial of the Gospel*, 35–60 in seeing Luke’s resolution of these two themes in the passion narrative.

²¹⁸ As Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 744 notes, Simeon’s prophecy (Luke 2:34) anticipates conflict throughout the narrative.

scribes, chief priests (Luke 9:21-22), people in general (Luke 9:44), and Gentiles (Luke 18:32). The first three of these groups, described as the συνέδριον at Luke 22:66, are implicated in the first passion prediction.²¹⁹ These Jewish leaders have questioned Jesus throughout the Lukan Jerusalem narrative,²²⁰ seeking to trap him by forcing him to incriminate himself in his teaching (Luke 19:47; 20:1, 20).²²¹ The elders, scribes, and chief priests play a leading role in the passion narrative, employing the services of Judas (Luke 22:2-6, 47-53), leading the soldiers to arrest Jesus (Luke 22:52), holding an initial hearing of Jesus (Luke 22:66-71), taking Jesus to Pilate for official condemnation (Luke 23:1-5), falsely accusing Jesus before Pilate and ‘Herod’ (Luke 23:2, 10), and finally persuading Pilate to send Jesus to his death (Luke 23:18-25).²²² The second and third passion predictions implicate ἄνθρωποι and ἔθνη, but we find the key to understanding to whom these terms refer by means of repetition of the verb παραδίδωμι in his passion account.²²³ The ἄνθρωποι and ἔθνη are Judas (Luke 22:48), Pilate (Luke 23:25), the chief priests, and rulers (Luke 24:20), all of whom hand Jesus over εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι (Luke 24:7). The λαοί are a group that wavers between support of Jesus and those who oppose him.²²⁴ At times, they are receptive to Jesus (Luke 7:29;

²¹⁹ Neagoe, *Trial of the Gospel*, 53; Brown, *Death*, 2:1427.

²²⁰ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 744 points out that Jerusalem is the location of conflict (cf. Luke 13:31-35; 18:31-33; 19:29--21:38).

²²¹ Neagoe, *Trial of the Gospel*, 48; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 189–190. Only the scribes play any significant role before the Jerusalem narrative, often working with the Pharisees to challenge Jesus’ teachings (Luke 5:21, 30; 6:7; 11:53; 15:2). See above on Luke 13:31 for the connection between the scribes and the Pharisees.

²²² Rightly, Brown, *Death*, 2:1425 states that the chief priests are the leaders of the opposition toward Jesus in the passion narratives. The elders, scribes, and chief priests continue their antagonism in Acts as well (cf. Acts 4:5; 6:12; 23:14; 24:1; 25:15).

²²³ See Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 328 on this term and his suggestion that Luke likely used it under the influence of Isa 53.

²²⁴ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 745.

19:48; 21:38), but find themselves to be part of the group that calls for Jesus' execution (Luke 23:15; cf. Acts 4:25-27), though they do not mock the crucified Jesus (Luke 23:35).²²⁵ All of the groups and individuals are implicated in the death of Jesus at Acts 4:25-27, which names the people, Gentiles, Pilate, and 'Herod' as those who gather against the Lord and his Messiah.²²⁶ The various conflicts between Jesus and these groups and individuals throughout the third gospel find their climax and focal point in the crucifixion of Jesus.

The conflict between Jesus and Satan envisioned in Luke-Acts also finds its climax in the passion narrative.²²⁷ The two pivotal moments in this conflict in the third gospel are the temptation narrative and the passion narrative. Following Jesus' baptism and genealogy, both of which show Jesus to be the Son of God, the temptation narrative (Luke 4:1-13) is the devil's attempt to undermine Jesus' divine status and derail his mission.²²⁸ Jesus thwarts these attempts by the devil, resisting the temptations and forcing the devil to concede that, for the time being, he has been defeated.²²⁹ After the temptation narrative, the devil does not appear in an active role in the story until the passion narrative where he enters Judas Iscariot, prompting the

²²⁵ Similarly, οἱ ὄχλοι (cf. Luke 5:15; 6:17; 8:4; 14:25). Note, it is the crowds who turn away from the dead Jesus repentant (Luke 23:48; cf. 18:13). See Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 165; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1476. On the mixed portrayals of the people and the crowds, see Brown, *Death*, 2:1422.

²²⁶ Brown, *Death*, 2:1422–1423 states that Luke's depiction of the people and the crowds turns decidedly negative in Acts (cf. 2:22-23; 3:12-15; 4:27; 13:27-28).

²²⁷ Neagoe, *Trial of the Gospel*, 36. This conflict will form a key component of our explanation of the role of composite 'Herod' in the next chapter. The narrative of Luke-Acts equates the devil and Satan as both 'names' are used to refer to the entity that causes physical maladies in people from which Jesus or his disciples free the oppressed. At three points in the third gospel, Luke describes healing and/or release from demonic oppression by both Jesus and his disciples as release from Satan and effecting his fall (Luke 10:1-21 [see v. 18]; 11:14-23 [v. 18]; 13:16). Later, at Acts 10:38, in Peter's speech to Cornelius, Luke writes that Jesus healed those who were oppressed by the devil.

²²⁸ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 506; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 191; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 182–183.

²²⁹ Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 41–42.

disciple to betray Jesus to the Sanhedrin.²³⁰ Judas' betrayal is the devil's καίρὸς (cf. Luke 4:13) and results in Jesus' arrest, trials, and execution (Luke 22:47—23:56).²³¹ The devil's antagonism lies behind the conflict between Jesus and the Jewish religious leaders (evidenced by the leaders' employment of Judas²³²) as well as other opposition toward Jesus and the early church (cf. Luke 4:1-13; 8:12; 22:31; Acts 5:3; 10:38; 13:10).

Both of these conflicts find their ultimate expression in the death of Jesus. Consistently throughout the third gospel, the Jewish religious leaders stand in opposition toward Jesus, attempting to trap him and finally succeeding in arresting him and procuring his execution. The devil seeks to derail the mission of Jesus and, by entering Judas, is a key figure behind Jesus' crucifixion. Ironically, it is through these conflicts, and specifically the trials and execution of Jesus, that the Christological statements concerning Jesus find their culmination.

Christological themes begin to develop in the birth narratives, which describe Jesus as Davidic King (Luke 1:32-33), Son of God (Luke 1:35), Lord (Luke 2:11), and Messiah (Luke 2:11).²³³ The portrayal of Jesus in these mutually informing terms

²³⁰ Brown, *Death*, 2:1402. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 141 rightly notes that the period prior to Judas' betrayal is not free of Satanic activity, but rather the time in which Jesus is on the offensive against diabolical forces, especially through his exorcisms. *Contra* Conzelmann, *Theology*, 27.

²³¹ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 753.

²³² Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 190.

²³³ Neagoe, *Trial of the Gospel*, 41. Rowe, *Narrative Christology*, 181–184 notes the lack of κυριός terminology in the trial and death scenes of Luke's gospel (after 22:61). According to Rowe, Jesus' Lordship 'inherently involves the suffering and death of his passion' and the removal of this title for Jesus in these scenes represents 'the identity-threatening movement in the narrative that is the rejection and execution of the Lord.'

unfolds to different extents throughout Luke-Acts²³⁴ and they bear on the passion narrative. In Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin, these Jewish leaders accuse him of claiming to be the Messiah, the Son of God, and a King (Luke 22:66—23:2).²³⁵ These Christological themes continue throughout the trials before Pilate and 'Herod' as well as in the accounts of Jesus' crucifixion and death. The kingship motif is evident in Pilate's only question to Jesus and his subsequent crucifixion of Jesus as King of the Jews (Luke 23:3, 37-38).²³⁶ Jesus' Messiahship comes into focus through the mockery of the rulers and the unrepentant criminal crucified alongside Jesus (Luke 23:35, 39). Finally, once again, Jesus is shown to be the Son of God with the cry from the cross in which Jesus addresses God as Father (Luke 22:46).²³⁷

Jesus' cry from the cross occurs immediately prior to the statement by the centurion, ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν (Luke 23:47).²³⁸ This highlights a related aspect of Luke's Christology, namely that of Jesus as the righteous and innocent sufferer.²³⁹ Several characters make declarations similar to that of the centurion at the cross. Most notable among them is Pilate, who three times states that

²³⁴ On Jesus as King, see Luke 19:38; 22:28-30; as Son of God, see Luke 4:41; as Messiah, see Luke 9:20; 20:41. In Luke's narrative, the Son of God is the Messiah (Luke 4:41) and the Messiah is the Royal, Davidic Messiah (Luke 20:41; 23:2). On the overlap between these terms see Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 195; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 747; Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 319, 321.

²³⁵ Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1462. Jesus' self-designation as 'Son of Man' (Luke 22:69) recalls his passion predictions, as Brown, *Death*, 1:258 notes.

²³⁶ Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1473–1474; Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 322–323. Brown, *Death*, 1:738–741 argues that the charge concerning Jesus as King is Pilate's focus, though in Brown's view this is a subordinate accusation to Jesus' perversion of the nation through his teaching.

²³⁷ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 747.

²³⁸ Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 330.

²³⁹ Robert J. Karris, *Luke, Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account as Literature*, Theological Inquiries (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1985), 110; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 747; Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 330; Robert F. O'Toole, 'Luke's Position on Politics and Society in Luke-Acts,' in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, ed. Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983), 6.

he has found no αἴτιος in Jesus (Luke 23:4, 14, 22).²⁴⁰ Pilate also informs the crowd that ‘Herod’ agrees with him in this verdict (Luke 23:15). Additionally, one of the criminals crucified along with Jesus declares that Jesus is innocent (Luke 23:41).²⁴¹ Jesus has done nothing worthy of death, yet goes to his death with minimal protestation, having ceased to respond to his accusers at Luke 23:3. Why would Jesus do such a thing?

Luke shows that Jesus’ destiny has been guided by divine necessity, indicated by use of the term δεῖ.²⁴² This term brings our discussion of the context of the Lukan passion narrative full circle, recalling the first passion prediction (Luke 9:22). Though not repeated in subsequent passion predictions, this term sets the course of Jesus’ ministry as it appears shortly before the decisive turn toward Jerusalem (Luke 9:51). Narratively, it was necessary for Jesus to suffer and die in accordance with the Scriptures (Luke 24:7, 26, 44; Acts 1:16).²⁴³ In this way, the action of the entire Lukan narrative, including the themes of conflict and Christology developed throughout the third gospel, is guided by divine necessity, culminating in the death and resurrection of Jesus.

²⁴⁰ Brown, *Death*, 1:742. In the words of Bond, *Pontius Pilate*, 159, ‘Luke’s major apologetic purpose in 23.1-25 is to use Pilate as the official witness to Jesus’ innocence...’

²⁴¹ Brown, *Death*, 1:742. As Karris and Strauss show, Luke’s depiction of Jesus as the suffering yet innocent and righteous one was likely inspired by Pss 22, 29, 31 and Isa 53. Karris, *Luke, Artist and Theologian*, 16–17, 90–91. Karris also shows how this theme features in several speeches in Acts (3:14; 7:52; 22:14). See Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 326–328 on the influence of Isa 53 in Luke’s passion narrative, especially in light of Acts 8:32–33.

²⁴² Marshall, *Luke*, 369 cites Luke 13:33; 17:25; 22:37; 24:7, 26, 44; Acts 17:3 where this word is used with reference to Jesus’ passion. See also Karris, *Luke, Artist and Theologian*, 52; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 747; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 780.

²⁴³ Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1545; Marshall, *Luke*, 369.

As expected, ‘Herod’s’ interaction with Jesus in Luke 23:6-12 illustrates the themes of conflict and Christology. ‘Herod’ contributes to the conflict motif in three ways. First, we have seen in our comments on Luke 3:1-2 above that Jesus’ principal accusers, the chief priests, led by Annas and Caiaphas, are part of the political backdrop against which the stories of John and Jesus take place. ‘Herod’ and the chief priests come together against Jesus at Luke 23:10. Second, the confrontation between Jesus and ‘Herod’ is anticipated by the ruler’s execution of John the Baptist and noting ‘Herod’s’ desire to see and to kill Jesus (Luke 9:7-9; 13:31).²⁴⁴ This lingering tension resolves as Pilate sends Jesus to ‘Herod’ for interrogation and a decision in the trial. Third, we have shown that ‘Herod’ exercises his authority under the ultimate authority of Satan (Luke 1:5; 4:5-6). Therefore, it is no surprise that the face-to-face meeting of Jesus and ‘Herod’ occurs because ‘Herod’ is one who holds ἐξουσία (Luke 23:7).

‘Herod’ also contributes to the Christological motifs examined here, particularly that of Jesus’ kingship and innocent suffering. I will argue that ‘Herod’s’ clothing Jesus in ἐσθῆτα λαμπράν is blatant mockery of Jesus’ kingship (Luke 23:11). Not only is this robe a mockery of Jesus’ kingship, apparently it also signified that ‘Herod’ believed that Jesus was innocent of the charges brought against him (Luke 23:15). Though ‘Herod’ did not believe that Jesus had done anything worthy of death, nevertheless Acts 4:25-27 implicates ‘Herod’ in Jesus’ death.

With this contextual understanding of the passion narrative in place, we will now examine Luke’s characterisation of ‘Herod’ at Luke 23:6-12. We will see that

²⁴⁴ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 195 reminds us that Herod’s thoroughly negative characterisation is well-known by this point.

this story portrays ‘Herod’ as one who is unable to rightly perceive who Jesus is because he is under the authority of the devil. ‘Herod’s’ inability to perceive Jesus is evident as Jesus refuses to respond to the ruler’s extensive interrogation. ‘Herod’s’ hostility comes to the fore when the king/ruler joins other hostile characters in mocking Jesus’ purported kingship. Finally, ‘Herod’ sends Jesus back to Pilate, apparently agreeing with Pilate’s verdict of Jesus’ innocence. This collusion between these two rulers results in their friendship (Luke 23:12), interpreted at Acts 4:25-27 as their condemnation of Jesus.²⁴⁵

The Trial Before ‘Herod’: Interrogation and Mockery

When Pilate hears the accusation that Jesus has been stirring up (ἀνασεύω) the people throughout Judaea, beginning in Galilee, he sees a potential way around the pressure to condemn the innocent Jesus: send the accused to ‘Herod’.²⁴⁶ Pilate’s

²⁴⁵ As Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 742 states, Luke has already cast Herod as a villain, thus setting the expectation that he will act accordingly toward Jesus in this pericope.

²⁴⁶ The oddity of Pilate’s action at this point has been explained in various ways. E.g., A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 24–32 has argued that Pilate was legally obligated to send Jesus to Herod. T. A. Burkill, ‘The Condemnation of Jesus: A Critique of Sherwin-White’s Thesis,’ *NovT* 12 (1970): 321–342 counters Sherwin-White and argues instead for a literary understanding of the Herodian trial, i.e., that the scene fulfils the prophecy of Psa 2:1-2. Evans, *Luke*, 332–333; Brown, *Death*, 1:766–767 believe that this was an act of political diplomacy. Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 804 states that Pilate believed Herod would have some insight regarding the Galilean. Harold W. Hoehner, ‘Why Did Pilate Hand Jesus over to Antipas?’, in *The Trial of Jesus: Cambridge Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule*, ed. Ernst Bammel, *Studies in Biblical Theology* 13 (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1970), 88 gives the simplest explanation - Pilate sent Jesus to Herod because he wanted to - but adds that Pilate may have wanted to rid himself of such an awkward case or perhaps as an act of diplomacy. Josef Blinzler, *The Trial of Jesus*, trans. Isabel and Florence McHugh (Cork: The Mercier Press Ltd., 1959), 195 also believes that Pilate’s actions indicate that he wished to be rid of the awkward case. Based on the narrative-critical methodology adopted in this thesis, Jesus is under ‘Herod’s’ authority, which makes the meeting between ‘Herod’ and Jesus a manifestation of the cosmic conflict between Jesus and the devil.

sending Jesus to ‘Herod’ recalls the political situations of Luke 1:5 and 3:1-2.²⁴⁷ The important matter in this regard is the claim that ‘Herod’ is one who has ἐξουσία (Luke 23:7), thus recalling ‘Herod’s’ rule as King under the authority of the devil, who himself holds authority over the kingdoms of the earth (Luke 1:5; 4:5-6).²⁴⁸ In Luke-Acts, ἐξουσία is usually dichotomous – authority is either the devil’s (Luke 4:6; 22:53; Acts 26:18) or God’s (Luke 12:5; Acts 1:7; 26:18).²⁴⁹ We may safely conclude that Jesus’ authority derives from God (Luke 4:32, 36; 5:24; 9:1; 10:19; 20:2, 8) and so does the authority he delegates to his apostles (Luke 9:1; 10:19; Acts 8:19). Given this dichotomous presentation of ἐξουσία, when religious (Acts 9:14; 26:10, 12) and political (Luke 12:11; 20:20; 23:7) authorities oppose Jesus and the early church, their ἐξουσία is evidence of the devil’s ultimate ἐξουσία (Luke 4:6). The point is clear: ‘Herod’ has received his authority from the devil and he exercises it here in the trial of Jesus.²⁵⁰

‘Herod’ and Jesus meeting face-to-face echoes ‘Herod’s’ desires to see Jesus and kill him (Luke 9:9; 13:31). To begin, ‘Herod’ sees Jesus, like many characters throughout Luke-Acts (Luke 5:12; 8:28; 19:3; Acts 7:55; 9:27), but ‘Herod’s’

²⁴⁷ We agree with Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 743 who states that Herod is a representative of the Roman Empire in the trial scene. This accords with our analysis of the depiction of ‘Herod’ in these synchronisms early in the gospel.

²⁴⁸ See above on Luke 1:5 and Brown, *Death*, 1:765; Robert F. O’Toole, *Acts 26: The Christological Climax of Paul’s Defense (Ac 22:1-26:32)*, *Analecta Biblica* 78 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 75. On God giving this authority to the devil, see Heinz Kruse, ‘Das Reich Satans,’ *Bib* 58 (1977): 47; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 143, n. 40; Johnson, *Luke*, 74.

²⁴⁹ Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom, *The Roman Empire in Luke’s Narrative*, LNTS 404 (London: T & T Clark, 2010), 91.

²⁵⁰ Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 195 notes that the trial of Jesus before Herod implies that the ruler had some authority and influence in Jerusalem. Blinzler, *Trial*, 195 states that Herod had authority in this instance because Pilate granted it to him. Brown, *Death*, 1:765, on the other hand, states that Herod had no authority in Jerusalem. However, my concern is not the historical (non-)reality of Herod’s authority in Judaea/Jerusalem. As Luke tells the story, ‘Herod’ has authority and is able to exercise it in Jerusalem.

responses to seeing Jesus are unique. ‘Herod’ is the only character to respond to seeing Jesus with ἐχάρη λίαν.²⁵¹ It is, however, an inappropriate joy because ‘Herod’s’ joy derives from his hope of seeing Jesus perform a sign and Luke 11:29-30 indicates that an evil (πονηρός) generation asks for a sign.²⁵² Second, of all those who see Jesus in Luke-Acts, ‘Herod’ is the only one who responds badly, treating Jesus with contempt and mocking him (Luke 23:11). In addition to these unique responses to seeing Jesus, ‘Herod’ questions Jesus, an action that is typical of Jesus’ enemies (Luke 17:20; 20:21, 28, 40; 22:64; 23:6, 9) or those who do not respond positively to Jesus’ teaching (Luke 18:18).²⁵³

Two earlier passages further complement this negative portrayal of ‘Herod’s’ seeing here. The first is the parable of the soils (Luke 8:4-15). In my discussion of Luke 8:3 above I noted the contrast between Joanna (who had seen and heard from Jesus and followed him) and ‘Herod’ (who desired to see Jesus with the presumed intent of killing him). Luke 23:8 states that ‘Herod’ ἦν...ἐξ ἱκανῶν χρόνων θέλων ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ ἀκούειν περὶ αὐτοῦ.²⁵⁴ This statement repeats the key ideas of seeing and hearing from the parable of the soil (and Luke 9:7-9) and anticipates a response to Jesus. Both ‘Herod’s’ desire to see a sign and his mockery of Jesus (see

²⁵¹ Brown, *Death*, 1:769–770 states that Herod’s emotional responses (Luke 23:8, 11) stand in contrast to Pilate’s straightforward dealings with Jesus.

²⁵² Omerzu, ‘Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,’ 126. Bovon, *Lukas (19,28-24,53)*, 403; Fitzmyer, *Luke XXIV*, 1481; Nolland, *Luke 18:35--24:53*, 1123 see Luke 11:29-30 as the inspiration for Luke 23:8. Brown, *Death*, 1:770 points out that the devil also sought a sign from Jesus (Luke 4:9-12). As Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 195 notes, Jesus repeatedly disappoints those who are seeking a sign.

²⁵³ The disciples also question Jesus when they have not understood Jesus’ teachings (Luke 8:9; 21:7).

²⁵⁴ See Marion L. Soards, ‘Herod Antipas’ Hearing in Luke 23.8,’ *BT* 37 (1986): 146–147 on the translation of this phrase. He argues that διὰ τὸ ἀκούειν περὶ αὐτοῦ should be understood substantively, which results in the translation ‘because of the things he heard about him.’ He refers to Luke 9:9 where the author states that it was Jesus’ actions that prompted Herod’s desire. Also, he argues that verbs of hearing connote the substantive quality of what is heard rather than the act of hearing itself.

below) are entirely inappropriate responses to seeing and hearing Jesus. A second passage that augments the negative depiction of ‘Herod’s’ seeing is Luke 10:24.²⁵⁵ Jesus utters this statement in response to the report of the seventy (seventy-two) regarding their missionary activity (10:1-18), stating that what that group of disciples has seen and heard is precisely what prophets and kings desired to see and hear but did not.²⁵⁶ ‘Herod’s’ inability to see and hear places him in contrast to the seventy disciples who have authority over the enemy and whose names are inscribed in the heavens (Luke 10:20). Additionally, Jesus’ comments at Luke 10:21-24 suggest that ‘Herod’s’ inability to see and hear means he is not μακάριος and that Jesus has chosen to reveal neither the Father nor himself to the ruler on this occasion (cf. Luke 10:22). Finally, Jesus’ silence before ‘Herod’ is evidence of the ruler’s inability to respond rightly to seeing and hearing Jesus. Jesus’ silence is not a defiant silence since he has previously responded to his accusers and questioners (Luke 22:67-70; 23:3).²⁵⁷ Instead, we should understand it as indicative of ‘Herod’s’ inability to hear²⁵⁸ and coinciding with Jesus’ unwillingness to answer questions directly because of the hearer’s unbelief (Luke 22:67-69).

Thus far in this pericope, ‘Herod’ is one who exercises the devil’s authority in Galilee and Jerusalem. This is consistent with what has been indicated elsewhere

²⁵⁵ Omerzu, ‘Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,’ 125–126; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 803.

²⁵⁶ The similarities in language between 23:8 and 10:24 are obvious with θέλω, εἶδον, and ἀκούω appearing in both passages. We remember that Luke identifies ‘Herod’ as a king on three occasions (Luke 1:5; Acts 4:26-27; 12:1) and his desire to see Jesus twice (Luke 9:9; 23:8).

²⁵⁷ Several scholars understand Jesus’ silence as a fulfilment of Isa 53:7, e.g., Marion L. Soards, ‘The Silence of Jesus before Herod: An Interpretive Suggestion,’ *ABR* 33 (1985): 41–45; Marshall, *Luke*, 856; Nolland, *Luke 18:35--24:53*, 1123; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 805; Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 743; Johnson, *Luke*, 367. Brown, *Death*, 1:772 believes that a connection with Isa 53:7 is possible in light of Luke’s citation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37, but does not see it as likely.

²⁵⁸ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 193–197.

with ‘Herod’ described as a king and ruler (Luke 1:5; 3:1, 19; 9:7; Acts 4:25-27; 12:1; cf. Luke 4:5-6). Also, ‘Herod’ is unable to truly hear and see Jesus because of his wrongheaded desire to see Jesus perform a sign, which is consistent with the characterisation of ‘Herod’ as one who has heard and rejected the message proclaimed by John the Baptist, Jesus, and the early church (Luke 3:19-20; 8:3; Acts 13:1). Before we turn to the depiction of ‘Herod’s’ own hostility toward Jesus described in 23:11 we will examine how that hostility intensifies as ‘Herod’ is part of a larger group of antagonistic entities, allowing their respective characterisations to inform the others.

In Luke 23:6-12, ‘Herod’ once again appears alongside other characters who display antagonism toward Jesus: ‘Herod’s’ soldiers, the chief priests, scribes, and Pilate.²⁵⁹ The chief priests and scribes are always antagonistic toward Jesus, particularly so in the passion narrative.²⁶⁰ This is especially true when they appear together, as they only appear together in contexts that refer to Jesus’ death (Luke 9:22; 19:47; 20:1, 19; 22:2, 66; 23:10). The chief priests are part of the larger group of Jewish leaders who want to kill Jesus (Luke 19:47; 22:2), arrest Jesus (Luke 22:52), ask for Barabbas’ release (Luke 23:13), and are blamed for Jesus’ death retrospectively (Luke 24:20). This pattern continues in Acts as they oppose the Jerusalem church (Acts 4:6, 23; 5:17-42), bring charges against Stephen (Acts 7:1),

²⁵⁹ Ibid., 190 states that Luke 22-23 contain a ‘rogue gallery of Jesus’ enemies’: the chief priests, scribes, Satan, Judas, the Sanhedrin, Pilate, and Herod. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 197 rightly claims that the Herodian trial represents political rejection of Jesus alongside the already present religious/Jewish rejection. Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 803 states that the Herodian trial of Jesus exhibits two motifs: 1) Rome’s aversion to acting justly in Jesus’ case and 2) the central role of the Jewish religious leaders in Jesus’ execution. Pilate’s role in Luke-Acts has been discussed above in the discussion of Acts 4:24-28; Luke 3:1-2. I refer the reader there and will not repeat that discussion here.

²⁶⁰ On the chief priests and scribes, see Brown, *Death*, 2:1425, 1427.

commission Saul to persecute believers (Acts 9:1; 22:5; 26:10-12), and bring charges against Paul (Acts 22:30; 23:2; 24:1; 25:2). Likewise, the scribes question and grumble against Jesus (Luke 5:21; 15:2; 20:1-2), are hostile toward him (Luke 11:53), want to kill Jesus (Luke 20:19; 22:2, 66), oppose the early church (Acts 4:5), and bring Stephen to trial (Acts 6:12).²⁶¹ In the Herodian trial narrative, the chief priests and scribes εὐτόνως κατηγοροῦντες Jesus (Luke 23:10), an action consistent with their rejection of Jesus (Luke 6:7) and later, Paul (Acts 22:30; 24:2, 8).

In the case of ‘Herod’s’ soldiers (στράτευμα), there is no way to interpret what they do here positively. However, soldiers (στράτευμα, στρατιώτης, στρατεύω) and centurions (έκοντάρχης) are typically neutral entities who perform their duties (Luke 7:8; Acts 10:7; 12:4, 6, 18; 21:32, 35; 22:25-26; 23:10, 17, 23, 27, 31; 24:23; 27:1, 6, 11, 31-32, 42; 28:16), are often repentant (Luke 3:14), come to Jesus for help (Luke 7:2, 6), and one declares Jesus δίκαιος (Luke 23:47). Cornelius the centurion is the prototypical Gentile convert in Acts 10-11, 15. There is one instance of a centurion not listening to Paul (Acts 27:11), but this centurion ultimately saves Paul and the other prisoners (Acts 27:43). On the other hand, those police officials associated with the Jerusalem Temple (ὕπηρέτης, στρατηγοί, στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ) are part of the larger group of Jewish leaders who oppose Jesus and the early Christian community. They arrest Jesus and subsequently mock him (Luke 22:2, 54, 63). The Captain of the Temple and his police seek to deter the activity of the apostles in Jerusalem (Acts 4:1; 5:22, 24, 26). The negative actions of the soldiers in this instance may be understood as a result of their being under ‘Herod’s’ authority

²⁶¹ The scribes do side with Paul in the argument that he started among the Sadducees and Pharisees concerning the resurrection (Acts 23:9).

(they are *his* soldiers, τοῖς στρατεύμασιν αὐτοῦ), which is diabolic. Their contempt and mockery of Jesus here contributes to the mixed portrayal of military personnel in Luke-Acts.

Opposition toward Jesus intensifies in this passage with the collusion of these groups (the Jewish leaders and ‘Herod’s’ soldiers) with ‘Herod’.²⁶² Before ‘Herod’ sends Jesus back to Pilate,²⁶³ three participles describe the ruler’s ill treatment of Jesus – ἐξουθενήσας δὲ αὐτὸν...καὶ ἐμπαίζας περιβαλὼν ἐσθῆτα λαμπράν.²⁶⁴ Ἐξουθενέω only appears elsewhere in Luke-Acts at Luke 18:9 and Acts 4:11, though it is the latter that is particularly pertinent here. Acts 4:11 alludes to Ps 117:22 (LXX), changing the psalm translator’s ἀπεδοκίμασαν to ἐξουθενηθείς. Remember the Jerusalem community’s response to Peter and John’s arrest envisions continuity between the experiences of Peter and John (and the Jerusalem community) and the passion of Jesus (Acts 4:23-31). The use of ἐξουθενέω in both Acts 4 and Luke 23 is

²⁶² There are several textual variants in 23:11-12, but none of them are of much consequence. The NA²⁸ has printed καὶ in brackets, though the earlier witnesses preserve it. As it stands, καὶ is emphatic and should be understood as ‘even Herod...’ or ‘Herod also...’ If it is removed, the sense changes little. See Bond, *Pontius Pilate*, 155. The D addition in 23:12 simply expands upon the previous hostility between Herod and Pilate. The change of αὐτῇ to ἐκείνῃ and/or αὐτοῦς to ἐαυτοῦς would not affect the meaning.

²⁶³ Ἀναπέμπω refers to the sending of a prisoner between governing officials (Luke 23:7, 11, 15; Acts 25:21). See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1481; Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 742; Bovon, *Lukas (19,28-24,53)*, 402; Hoehner, ‘Why Did Pilate?’, 86. For ἀναπέμπω as referring to sending a prisoner to a higher authority, see BDAG, 70; LSJ, 115. On the other hand, Marshall, *Luke*, 855; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 804 state that the term does not have a technical force here, but in the narrative, Pilate and ‘Herod’s’ agreement about Jesus indicates that both rulers believed they were acting officially. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1818; Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 234 incorrectly assert that the term only has connotations of official action at Acts 25:21.

²⁶⁴ The three aorist participles point to antecedent action that occurred before ‘Herod’ sent Jesus back to Pilate. Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 805 is clearest on this point, stating that there is no reason ‘that, without further notice, the third [participle] would depart so significantly from the first two...’. Also see Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1482; Marshall, *Luke*, 856–857; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1820. Several scholars, who want to make the clothing of Jesus subsequent to the contempt and mockery, believe that the third participle should be understood as more closely related to ‘Herod’s’ sending Jesus back to Pilate, e.g., Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 242, n.3; Brown, *Death*, 1:773–774; Bovon, *Lukas (19,28-24,53)*, 406; Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 200. I disagree with Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 225, who believes that ‘Herod’s’ mistreatment of Jesus is inexplicable. This conclusion ignores the characterisation of ‘Herod’ thus far.

one more correspondence that further demonstrates this and also recalls ‘Herod’s’ rejection of Jesus in the Acts pericope. The word ἐμπαίζω only twice outside the passion narrative in the gospel (never in Acts), one of which is a passion prediction (Luke 18:32) in which the Lukan Jesus anticipates the mockery he must endure in Jerusalem.²⁶⁵ The recurrence of the terms at Luke 23:11 includes ‘Herod’ in the group that Jesus envisioned would be responsible for his death. Next, ‘Herod’ dresses Jesus in brilliant clothing (περιβαλὼν ἐσθῆτα λαμπράν) as evidence of the ruler’s contempt for and mockery of the defendant.²⁶⁶ Ἐσθῆς is the garb of angels in Luke-Acts (Luke 24:4; Acts 1:10; 10:30), with Acts 10:30 describing the angelic being who appears to Cornelius as clothed ἐν ἐσθῇτι λαμπρᾷ.²⁶⁷ Other than Jesus and angels, the only person to wear an ἐσθῆς is, of all people, ‘Herod’ (Acts 12:21), who puts on his ἐσθῆτα βασιλικήν before addressing a delegation from Tyre and Sidon.²⁶⁸ As a result, the crowd hails ‘Herod’ as a god and he is subsequently struck down by an angel of the Lord. With these observations in mind, we may conclude that the author of Luke-Acts sees a two-level meaning in ‘Herod’s’ clothing Jesus in Luke 23:11. The first level of meaning is evident, as Pilate interprets ‘Herod’s’ returning Jesus clothed in this way as an indication of ‘Herod’s’ agreement with his not guilty

²⁶⁵ In the passion narrative, various soldiers are the ones who mock Jesus (presumably the Temple police in Luke 22:63; cf. 22:54; also see 23:36). Here, ‘Herod’ joins his own soldiers in the mockery. Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 803–804; Johnson, *Luke*, 368 conclude that one of the literary functions of the Herod trial is to fulfil Jesus’ prediction regarding mockery. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1479; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 853 point out that Luke’s redaction of Mark 15:16-20 at this point moves the mockery of the soldiers to Herod and his soldiers. The other occurrence of ἐμπαίζω is found at Luke 14:29.

²⁶⁶ Paul Joüon, ‘Luk 23,11: Ἐσθῆτα Λαμπράν,’ *RSR* 26 (1936): 80–85 deals extensively with the options for understanding what exactly this clothing was. After exploring possible parallels to the enrobing in the Roman west (e.g., the *toga candida*) and in the Jewish east (e.g., symbolising purity or social distinction), Joüon concludes, with the narrative of Luke, that the ἐσθῆς simply signifies Jesus’ innocence.

²⁶⁷ This is the only other Lukan usage of λαμπρός.

²⁶⁸ Johnson, *Luke*, 366; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 852–853 both note the contrast between Jesus and Herod provided by the clothing.

verdict (Luke 23:15; cf. 23:4, 14).²⁶⁹ As a second level of meaning, this action mocks Jesus' divine kingship. As noted by Pilate and the Jewish leaders (Luke 23:3), the mockery of the soldiers at the crucifixion, and the inscription on the cross (Luke 23:37-38), the primary charge against Jesus in the trial is that he claims to be King of the Jews.²⁷⁰ The related charges are that Jesus is the Christ (Luke 22:67, a claim that appears to be equivalent to kingship in Luke 23:3), and that he is the Son of God (Luke 22:70).²⁷¹ Of course, for Luke, Jesus is all of these things; the charges are true but wrongly understood by Jesus' accusers.²⁷² However, the focus of the accusations is that Jesus claims to be the King of the Jews. If all three of 'Herod's' actions in Luke 23:11 are directed against Jesus because of this claim (and the entire thrust of the narrative points to that conclusion),²⁷³ then the second way to understand the ruler's clothing of Jesus in brilliant clothing is as a mockery of Jesus' kingship.²⁷⁴

²⁶⁹ Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 120–121; Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 243; Omerzu, 'Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,' 126; Brown, *Death*, 1:775–776; A. W. Varrall, 'Christ Before Herod: Luke xxiii 1-16,' *JTS* 39 (1909): 343; Joüon, 'Luc 23,11,' 84.

²⁷⁰ Carroll, *Luke*, 459; Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 240. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 188 notes that the rejection of Jesus' kingship at Luke 19:39-40 prepares for the rejection of his kingship throughout the passion narrative; Frank Matera, 'Luke 23,1-25. Jesus before Pilate, Herod, and Israel,' in *L'Évangile de Luc / The Gospel of Luke*, ed. Frans Neirynck, rev. and enlarged ed., BETL 32 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989), 539–541 rightly claims that the accusation against Jesus here is reminiscent of Acts 17:6-7, but wrongly states that the primary charge against Jesus is perverting the people.

²⁷¹ J. C. O'Neill, 'The Silence of Jesus,' *NTS* 15 (1968): 162 equates 'King of the Jews' and 'Messiah'. These charges are political charges, as noted by Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 243; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 840. Paul W. Walasky, 'The Trial and Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke,' *JBL* 94 (1975): 82 unnecessarily distinguishes between 'Christ' and 'Son of God'.

²⁷² Χριστός (Luke 2:11; 4:41; 9:20; 24:46; Acts 2:36; 5:42; 8:5; 17:3; 18:28; 28:31). Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke 1:35; 3:38; 4:41; Acts 9:20). Βασιλεύς (Luke 19:38; 23:3; Acts 17:7; cf. Luke 1:32-33).

²⁷³ As Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 805 states, the three participles of Luke 23:11 represent 'a dramatic accumulation of actions similar in nature.'

²⁷⁴ Our interpretation here accords with that of Brown, *Death*, 1:775–776, who sees the clothing as a mockery of kingship and an indication of Jesus' innocence. See also Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 805–806; Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 240; Johnson, *Luke*, 366, 368; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1820–1821; Evans, *Saint Luke*, 852–853; Plummer, *St. Luke*, 523; Blinzler, *Trial*, 199; Pierson Parker, 'Herod Antipas and the Death of Jesus,' in *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church*, ed. E. P. Sanders (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987), 206. Wolter, *Lukasevangelium*, 743–744 concludes that it is unclear whether the robe is part of Herod's mockery of Jesus or is intended to signify Jesus' innocence to Pilate. As my exegesis has shown, it is both. I disagree with Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1480, 1482; Nolland, *Luke*

So, ‘Herod’ has unknowingly clothed Jesus appropriately. Jesus is the King of the Jews. Incongruously, ‘Herod’s’ antagonism toward Jesus in this story does not end as Luke 13:31 indicates that it should have. ‘Herod’ neither kills Jesus, as he had John, nor does he order Jesus’ execution. Instead, ‘Herod’ simply sends Jesus back to Pilate.²⁷⁵ There are no further details beyond the statement that this incident serves to mend a prior rift in the relationship between the two rulers and leads to their ensuing friendship (Luke 23:12).²⁷⁶ ‘Herod’ and Pilate’s friendship, and indeed the whole episode, stands behind the passage we have identified as the central Lukan reflection on the role of ‘Herod’ in the narrative, Acts 4:25-27. We will now briefly revisit this key passage in order to sum up our discussion of ‘Herod’ and Jesus in Luke-Acts.

Condemning the Innocent: Luke 23:6-12 and Acts 4:25-27

I have discussed the centrality of Acts 4:25-27 for the characterisation of ‘Herod’ above. Luke 23:1-25 provides the impetus for the blame for Jesus’ death

18:35--24:53, 1124 who understand the clothing as part of the mockery of Jesus, but that it does not connote royalty. Omerzu, ‘Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,’ 126; Jensen, *Herod Antipas*, 120–121; Varrall, ‘Christ Before Herod,’ 343; Joüon, ‘Luc 23,11,’ 84 do not believe the clothing is part of Herod’s ridicule of Jesus, but only a sign of innocence.

²⁷⁵ I agree with Omerzu, ‘Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,’ 130 who states that the literary function of the pericope is to prepare for the conclusion drawn by Pilate at 23:14-15 concerning Jesus’ innocence.

²⁷⁶ Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 170; Green, *Gospel of Luke*; Jervell, *Theology*, 100–101 all claim that the best commentary on Pilate and Herod’s friendship is Acts 4:26-27. Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 180–181 speculates that Luke 13:1 hints at the source of hostility between Herod and Pilate and that 23:7 is Pilate’s attempt to appease Herod. I agree with Richardson, *Herod*, 311, who correctly states that there is essentially no historical evidence for hostility between Herod and Pilate. Moreover, and directly related to our purposes, there is no evidence for the latent hostility between Herod and Pilate in the Lukan narrative.

assigned to ‘Herod’ and Pilate in Acts 4:27.²⁷⁷ How is it possible that so much responsibility is hoisted upon these two rulers? In light of the literary investigation underway, Luke 23:1-25 and Acts 4:25-27 must be understood as mutually informing.²⁷⁸ The former anticipates the latter; the latter interprets the former and applies it to the situation of the early church.²⁷⁹ Accordingly, despite the fact that Jesus’ death happened according to God’s plan (βουλή; Acts 4:28), ‘Herod’ and Pilate share in the blame because they are among the opponents of Jesus in Jerusalem. Though it may be uncomfortable given the seemingly disparate portrayals

²⁷⁷ Marion L. Soards, ‘Tradition, Composition, and Theology in Luke’s Account of Jesus Before Herod,’ *Bib* 66 (1985): 361–363; Marshall, *Luke*, 854; Evans, *Luke*, 333; Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 244 all believe that, in addition to fulfilling Psa 2:1-2, the trial before Herod gives Luke an opportunity to provide the second witness to Jesus’ innocence necessitated by Deut 19:15. On the contrary, Brown, *Death*, 1:772 believes that Deut 19:15 is not immediately applicable here.

²⁷⁸ The classic treatment of the relation between Luke 23 and Acts 4 is Dibelius, ‘Herodes und Pilatus’. Dibelius argues that the Herodian trial is a Lukan creation based on the author’s interpretation of Psa 2:1-2 as he expresses it in Acts 4:25-27. Walasky, ‘Trial and Death,’ 88; Burkill, ‘Condemnation of Jesus,’ 331; Parker, ‘Herod Antipas’ follow Dibelius. Apparently agreeing with Dibelius, Conzelmann, *Theology*, 91 notes that Acts 4:27; 3:13f; 13:28 are part of a ‘group of formulae which trace the death of Jesus back to the combined efforts of Jews and Gentiles, including Herod’, but that Acts 4:27 is the clearest. Rightly, Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1479, counters Dibelius and contends that neither Psa 2:1-2 nor Acts 4:27-28 provide the origin of the episode, but once one reads the passage in Acts the many connections between the passages become clear. Varrall, ‘Christ Before Herod,’ 322 concludes similarly to Fitzmyer. Brown, *Death*, 1:778, 783 allows that Acts 4 has influenced Luke 23, but prefers to read Luke 23 as a redaction of Mark. Marshall, *Luke*, 854 is curiously hesitant to make the connection between Luke 23 and Acts 4 preferring instead to see the Herodian trial only in light of Deut 19:15. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1816 says that Acts 4 shows the rulers as co-conspirators in Jesus’ death but that Luke 23 does not. Matera, ‘Luke 23,1-25,’ 542, 545 believes that Acts 4 is based on a different source than the Lukan passion and is, therefore, at odds with Luke 23. Instead, he sees Paul’s trial before Agrippa as the inspiration for Jesus’ trial before Herod. A related matter is the relation between Psa 2:1-2 and the Herodian trial scene. Johnson, *Luke*, 368 argues that one of the literary functions of the trial before Herod is to show how Psa 2 is fulfilled. Joseph B. Tyson, ‘The Lukan Version of the Trial of Jesus,’ *NovT* 3 (1959): 256 states that it is unlikely that Luke composed the Herodian trial to demonstrate the fulfilment of Psa 2:1-2 in the life of Jesus. Later, Joseph B. Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Charleston: University of South Carolina Press, 1986), 133 claims that the Herodian trial is consistent with the interpretation of Psa 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-27. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1822 states that the early church understood the Herodian trial as a fulfilment of Psa 2:1-2 as Acts 4:24-28 indicates, but that it is unclear if Luke has that in mind. Soards, ‘Tradition,’ 362 prefers to see no connection at all between Psa 2:1-2 and Luke 23. Since we have concluded that Acts 4:24-28 interprets Luke 23:1-25 and applies it to the situation of the Jerusalem church, then we must understand the citation of Psa 2:1-2 at Acts 4:25-26 as part of the interpretation of the Herodian trial scene, but not the inspiration for the free creation of Luke 23:6-12 by the author.

²⁷⁹ As Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 196–197 states, the passion looks to Acts 4:26-27 and Acts 4:25-28 is an ‘important review of the passion story.’

of ‘Herod’ in these two texts, we must hold this understanding of the two passages in tension.²⁸⁰ In Luke 23:8-12, ‘Herod’ ridicules and mocks Jesus, and concurs with Pilate’s verdict (Luke 23:13-25). In Acts 4:27, ‘Herod’ is, with Pilate, a representative king and ruler who takes his stand against the Lord and the Messiah.²⁸¹ Not only this, but at Acts 4:25-27, the trials and death of Jesus become the framework by which the trials and deaths of early Christians in the Book of Acts are interpreted. This connection between the two passages is vitally important to keep in mind as we examine the next passage which features ‘Herod’, Acts 12:1-6.

Conclusion: ‘Herod’ and Jesus

‘Herod’s’ rejection and execution of John the Baptist foreshadows the ruler’s antagonism toward Jesus. Luke 1:5 sets the tension between ‘Herod’ and Jesus (cf. Luke 1:32-33) where the two characters are rival kings. From there, the tension escalates. Reports concerning Jesus have come to ‘Herod’ resulting in his desire to see Jesus (Luke 9:7-9). This is no inquisitive, curious desire however, as ‘Herod’ wishes to kill Jesus (Luke 13:31). ‘Herod’s’ desire to kill Jesus is evidence that the ruler had rejected the message Jesus preached. Oblique references to members of ‘Herod’s’ own household, Joanna and Manaen, who had responded rightly to the message Jesus proclaimed (Luke 8:3; Acts 13:1), provide evidence to this effect. In light of this escalating tension, the meeting of ‘Herod’ and Jesus in the Lukan passion account is somewhat anti-climactic, which only relates ‘Herod’s’

²⁸⁰ Evans, *Saint Luke*, 849.

²⁸¹ I emphatically disagree with Hoehner, *Herod Antipas*, 227 who states that Luke pictures Herod as free of responsibility for Jesus’ death.

inappropriate desire to see Jesus perform a miracle, the ruler's mockery of Jesus, and his sending Jesus back to Pilate. The tension finds its resolution at Acts 4:27, which implicates 'Herod' in the death of Jesus. As we have seen above, Acts 4:25-27 not only interprets 'Herod's' antagonism toward Jesus but also proleptically looks to 'Herod's' antagonism toward the church in the Book of Acts. At Acts 12:1-6 we see 'Herod' openly persecuting the Jerusalem church, particularly the apostles James and Peter, in a manner that accords with the characterisation of the King elsewhere.

'Herod', the Apostles, and the Early Church

Open Persecution: Acts 12:1-6

Context of Acts 12:1-6

The narrative of Acts following 4:23-31 describes the geographically widening mission of the church envisioned by Jesus' instructions to his disciples at Acts 1:8. Led by the apostles, the Christians witness in Jerusalem and Judaea (Acts 2:1—8:1), then in Samaria as a result of persecution (Acts 8:2-25), and finally to the Gentiles (Acts 8:26-40; 10:1—11:18). The church is extremely successful in its witness to the risen Christ in these early chapters of Acts, gaining many adherents (cf. Acts 2:41; 4:4; 9:31; 10:44-48), though this success does not come without obstacles, particularly opposition from the Jewish leadership in Jerusalem (cf. Acts 4:1-23; 5:17-28; 8:1). Ironically, the attempts of the Jewish leaders to silence or quell the mission lead to further success (cf. Acts 4:31; 5:42; 8:4).

Two important figures emerge in the first twelve chapters of Acts, Peter and Paul. Peter is the key leader of the Church in Jerusalem and Judaea with his

leadership centred on proclaiming the gospel to both Jews and Gentiles (Acts 1:15; 2:14, 38; 3:12; 4:8; 8:14; 10:46-48).²⁸² Saul (Paul) enters the narrative as a leader in the earliest Jewish persecution of the church which was initiated with Stephen's death (Acts 7:58—8:1, 3; 9:1).²⁸³ Saul's encounter with the risen and exalted Jesus on the road to Damascus is the moment of his transformation in the Lukan narrative (Acts 9:3-19). After this event, Saul becomes the key leader of the worldwide Christian mission according to the narrative of Acts.²⁸⁴

'Herod' once again appears in Jerusalem during a time of peace for the church that followed Saul's conversion (cf. Acts 9:31). With his appearance this period of peace for the church comes to an abrupt end as 'Herod' the king (cf. Luke 1:5; Acts 4:26-27) becomes an active persecutor of the church in Judaea (Acts 12:1-6). This story occurs at a pivotal moment in the narrative. First, though the gospel has spread to Gentiles, this has happened only in and around Palestine. Beginning at Acts 13, the gospel will advance from Palestine to Rome. Second, the story of 'Herod's' imprisonment of Peter effectively signals the end of the apostle's role in Luke-Acts apart from a brief appearance at the Jerusalem council in Acts 15:7.²⁸⁵ At Acts 13, and particularly following the story of the Jerusalem council, the narrative focus shifts to the missionary travels of Paul.²⁸⁶ Pervo summarises this narrative shift, 'Jerusalem and Peter are central in chaps. 1-12; Paul and the Diaspora in chaps.

²⁸² Andrew D. Clarke, *Parallel Lives: The Relation of Paul to the Apostles in the Lukan Perspective*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2001), 129.

²⁸³ Pervo, *Acts*, 198.

²⁸⁴ Johnson, *Acts*, 166.

²⁸⁵ Clarke, *Parallel Lives*, 133.

²⁸⁶ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 496.

13-28.²⁸⁷ As we will see in the next chapter, the narrative of the death of ‘Herod’ (Acts 12:20-23) is the pivot point for this shift, signalling that political persecution will not hinder the outward spread of the gospel.²⁸⁸ For now our concern is the characterisation of ‘Herod’ as persecutor of the church in Acts 12:1-6. ‘Herod’s’ appearance at Acts 4:27 prepares for his re-entry into the narrative here and his persecution of John the Baptist and Jesus anticipates his persecution of the church at Acts 12:1-6. Accordingly, our analysis of this passage will show the portrayal of ‘Herod’ as a violent king who persecutes the church, imprisoning and executing its key leaders.

Another Execution and Imprisonment: Acts 12:1-6

‘Herod’ re-enters the narrative suddenly and ferociously when he ἐπέβαλεν...τὰς χεῖρας κακῶσαι τινὰς τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.²⁸⁹ Again we observe here continuity between the experiences of Jesus and the early church. The parallels between this scene and the Lukan passion narrative are more extensive and explicit than those between this scene and the narrative of the execution of John the

²⁸⁷ Pervo, *Acts*, 319.

²⁸⁸ Further illustrating this conclusion, we will also examine one final passage in the next chapter, the scene of Paul’s trial before Agrippa which occurs in the ominous setting of ‘Herod’s’ Praetorium in Caesarea (Acts 23:35).

²⁸⁹ ‘Herod’ is the only person to lay *violent* hands on people in Luke-Acts. Though Robert W. Wall, ‘Acts,’ *NIB* X, 178 distinguishes between the three Herods of Luke-Acts, he notes that the Herod of Acts 12 is the third king named Herod to lay violent hands on those who belong to the church. Daniel Schwartz, *Agrippa I: The Last King of Judaea*, TSAJ 23 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990), 123 unnecessarily limits τινὰς (Acts 12:1) to James and Peter. Instead, we should view the focus on James and Peter as specific instances of ‘Herod’ laying violent hands on some of the church. Focus on the apostles as representatives of the church is consistent throughout Acts (see 1:2, 17; 2:14; 4:23-31, 35) and Peter is a major character in Acts 1-12.

Baptist.²⁹⁰ These parallels contribute further to Luke's consistent portrayal of 'Herod' as an archetypal antagonist of God's plan.²⁹¹ The feast of Unleavened Bread/Passover provides the setting for the arrests of both Jesus and Peter (Acts 12:3-4; Luke 22:1, 7-8; 23:6-7). Ἐπιβάλλω χεῖρας describes 'Herod's' aggression toward the church as well as the religious leaders' desire to rid themselves of Jesus (Acts 12:1; Luke 20:19). Ἐπιβάλλω χεῖρας is a euphemism for arresting someone (cf. Luke 20:19; Acts 4:3; 5:18; 21:27), typically as an act of persecution²⁹² and is related to several other terms in this text: συλλαμβάνω (Acts 12:3), πιάζω, τίθημι φυλακὴν, and παραδίδωμι (Acts 12:4). Συλλαμβάνω refers to the arrests of both Jesus and Peter (Acts 12:3; Luke 22:54), both of whom are handed over (παραδίδωμι) to various officials (Acts 12:4; Luke 20:20; cf. Luke 9:22; 18:32; 23:35; 24:7, 20; Acts 3:13). Furthermore, ἐπιβάλλω χεῖρας, τίθημι φυλακὴν, and παραδίδωμι recall Jesus' prophecy to his disciples that they would face persecution from various ruling authorities (Luke 21:12), which is partly fulfilled in this story. 'Herod' is the grammatical subject of these verbs, which indicates that he is responsible for the imprisonment of any Christians in general (Acts 12:1) and Peter in particular (Acts 12:4).²⁹³ Finally, 'Herod' is squarely in the same category as others who oppose Jesus and his followers, especially unbelieving Jews and their leaders (ἐπιβάλλω

²⁹⁰ O. Wesley Allen, Jr., *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS 158 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 138–140; Johnson, *Acts*, 218; Parsons, *Acts*, 171; Witherington III, *Acts*, 382; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 2: 152–153; F. Scott Spencer, *Journeying through Acts: A Literary-Cultural Reading* (Peabody: Hendricksen, 2004), 135; Robert W. Wall, 'Successors to "the Twelve" According to Acts 12:1-17,' *CBQ* 53 (1991): 635; David P. Moessner, 'The Christ Must Suffer: New Light on the Jesus - Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts,' *NovT* 28 (1986): 220–256.

²⁹¹ Parsons, *Acts*, 172.

²⁹² Pervo, *Acts*, 302.

²⁹³ Witherington III, *Acts*, 384; Bruce, *Acts*, 281 rightly speculate that Herod's probable motive for attacking the apostles is to cut the movement off at the head.

χεῖρας, Luke 20:19; Acts 4:3; 5:18; 21:27; κακόω, Acts 14:2; παραδίδωμι, Acts 3:13)²⁹⁴ and Judas (συλλαμβάνω, Acts 1:16; παραδίδωμι, Luke 22:4, 6, 21-22, 48; cf. Luke 9:22; 18:32). Soldiers keep Peter in custody, just as they held Jesus while mocking him (Acts 12:4; Luke 23:36; cf. Luke 23:11). Acts 12:4, 6 indicates that ‘Herod’ intends to bring Peter out (ἀνάγω, προάγω), presumably to be executed,²⁹⁵ just as Jesus was led out to execution (ἀπάγω, Luke 23:26; cf. Acts 12:19).²⁹⁶

Repetition of these key ideas casts the experiences of Peter and the early church at the hands of ‘Herod’ as parallel to and an extension of those of Jesus in the third gospel. In a final parallel to the passion narrative (also recalling Acts 4:27), ‘Herod’ understood his execution of James as pleasing to the Jews, thus leading the king to imprison Peter with the intention of ordering his execution before ὁ λαός, the same group who clamoured for Jesus’ death (Luke 23:13, 18) and implicated in Jesus’ execution with ‘Herod’ (Acts 4:25-27). In these ways, Acts 12:1-6 depicts ‘Herod’ as a persecutor of both Jesus and the church.²⁹⁷

²⁹⁴ Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, 210 states that Herod is inextricably tied to the Jews. ‘Herod’s’ collusion with the Jews is apparent also at Acts 12:11 and Luke 23:10.

²⁹⁵ Matthew L. Skinner, *Locating Paul: Places of Custody as Narrative Settings in Acts 21-28*, Academia Biblica 13 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 88–89; Martin Hengel, *Saint Peter: The Underestimated Apostle*, trans. Thomas H. Trapp (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010), 90; Parsons, *Acts*, 171; Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 577; Gaventa, *Acts*, 184. Johnson, *Acts*, 211 notes that this detail adds tension to the narrative.

²⁹⁶ Spencer, *Journeying*, 135; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 490.

²⁹⁷ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 485; Gaventa, *Acts*, 183; David Parry, ‘Release of the Captives: Reflections on Acts 12,’ in *Luke’s Literary Achievement*, ed. C. M. Tuckett, JSNTSS 116 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 159 sees Herod as a representative Jewish opponent. This is true, but neglects the political characterisation of Herod as king and ruler at Acts 4:27.

Even more alarming than ‘Herod’s’ imprisonment of Peter is his execution of James the apostle²⁹⁸ with the sword (μαχαίρη),²⁹⁹ an action indicating that ‘Herod’ viewed the Christians as a political threat (cf. Luke 21:24; 22:52; Acts 16:27).³⁰⁰ Further, ‘Herod’ is the subject of the verb ἀνεῖλεν (Acts 12:2; cf. Acts 2:23; 10:39; 22:20), which lays explicit blame on the king for this act.³⁰¹ The characterisation of ‘Herod’ here is consistent as James’ execution alludes to the king’s beheading of John the Baptist.³⁰² As in the πρῶτον λόγον, ‘Herod’ is a destructive force (cf. Luke 13:31).

Further illustrating ‘Herod’s’ persecution and destructiveness, Garrett shows parallels between ‘Herod’ and Satan in Acts 12.³⁰³ Garrett notes that as Peter’s experience in Acts recapitulates Jesus’ passion, and Satan orchestrated the death of Jesus (cf. Luke 22:3, 53), ‘the comparison of Herod with Satan...also lies close at

²⁹⁸ James is linked to Peter (and John) throughout the third gospel (Luke 5:10; 8:51; 9:28), but he is not a significant character in Acts, appearing elsewhere only in the list of apostles at 1:13. This is not to minimise the narration of his death here as he is the only martyred apostle in Acts.

²⁹⁹ Johnson, *Acts*, 211, citing m.*Sanh.* 7.2, states that beheading was the most shameful way to die.

³⁰⁰ Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 574–575; Witherington III, *Acts*, 385; Nicolas H. Taylor, ‘The Temptation of Jesus on the Mountain: A Palestinian Christian Polemic Against Agrippa I,’ *JSNT* 83 (2001): 45.

³⁰¹ Gaventa, *Acts*, 183. Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 1:574 states that Luke always uses ἀναιρέω to connote destructiveness except at Acts 7:21. ‘Herod’s’ destructive nature has already been noted by Luke in his depiction of the ruler as a fox.

³⁰² Spencer, *Journeying*, 134; Pervo, *Acts*, 303. Bruce, *Acts*, 281 does not believe that a parallel between James and John the Baptist is probable. Haenchen, *Acts*, 382 sees a connection between Acts 12:2 and Mark 6:17 as summary execution scenes.

³⁰³ Susan Garrett, ‘Exodus from Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1-24,’ *CBQ* 52 (1990): 656–680. In her article, the Exodus narrative serves as a paradigmatic typological event for many biblical narratives, including the death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus. She interprets Acts 12 as a type of the Exodus narrative with Herod playing the part of Pharaoh and Peter’s release representing release from bondage. As such, for her, Acts 12 also recapitulates the passion as well. She draws her examples from the scene of ‘Herod’s’ death (Acts 12:20-23) which we will examine more extensively in the next chapter. For now, we refer to Garrett’s parallels between ‘Herod’ and Satan in order to illustrate ‘Herod’s’ antagonism toward the various protagonists of Luke-Acts. I have previously noted that as an earthly ruler, ‘Herod’s’ authority derives from the devil’s authority over the kingdoms of the earth (see my comments on Luke 1:5; cf. Luke 4:5-6).

hand.³⁰⁴ She also notes Satan's desire to make himself a god (Luke 4:6-7), which parallels 'Herod's' failure to deflect the divine praise issued to him by the crowd in Acts 12:22.³⁰⁵ 'Herod' is regularly depicted in light of the authority of Satan; Acts 12 is no different. The authority of the quintessential spiritual enemy of Jesus and the church, the devil, lies behind all opposition to the people of God, including 'Herod's' attempts to squash the Christian movement in Jerusalem. The consistently negative portrayal of 'Herod' in Luke-Acts – the one who executes God's prophet, the king/ruler who took his stand against Jesus, the persecutor of the church – is abundantly clear.

Conclusion: 'Herod', the Apostles, and the Early Church

The first eleven chapters of Acts narrates the geographic expansion of the witness of the early church from Jerusalem and Judaea, to Samaria, and to the Gentile world (cf. Acts 1:8). This expansion has been successful even in the face of opposition and persecution. While the opponents of the church in the early chapters of Acts are the Jewish leaders, it is no surprise that the first political figure to

³⁰⁴ To support this assertion, with which I agree, she claims that Luke casts the account of 'Herod's' death (Acts 12:20-23) so as to recall a matrix of intertextual echoes drawn from the prophecies/narratives of fallen kings in Isa 14; Ezek 28-32; 2 Macc 9. Garrett, 'Exodus,' 675–677. The intertextual echoes she notes include Antiochus' belief that he was divine (2 Macc 9:12), God smiting people with incurable plagues/worms (Isa 14:11; 2 Macc 9:5-12), and Israel's trading food with Tyre (Ezek 27:17) before the description of the downfall of the prince of Tyre (Ezek 28). Also see Parsons, *Acts*, 178; Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 111. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 486 focuses on Ezek 28:17-20 as the background of this passage. We can safely conclude that 'Herod's' death, the most horrible recounted in Luke-Acts, evidences God's retribution toward this diabolical ruler even without the intertextual echoes noted by Garrett and others.

³⁰⁵ Garrett, 'Exodus,' 677. 'Herod's' acceptance of divine praise stands in contrast to Peter, Paul, and Barnabas who refuse worship (Acts 10:25-26; 14:11-18). Taylor, 'Temptation of Jesus' has likely read too much into Luke 4:5-8, making that passage a Lukan literary creation that reflects an anti-Agrippa stance of the early Palestinian church.

persecute the church is ‘Herod’. ‘Herod’s’ persecution of the church is foreshadowed by the prayer of the Jerusalem church after the imprisonment of Peter and John (Acts 4:25-27). In that prayer, ‘Herod’ is a representative political opponent, recalling the king/ruler’s antagonism toward both Jesus and John the Baptist. Similarly, Acts 12:1-6 casts ‘Herod’s’ execution of James, his awareness of how this apostle’s death pleased the Jews, and his imprisonment of Peter (with the intent to execute the apostle) in terms that specifically recall ‘Herod’s’ earlier antagonism toward both Jesus and John. I also briefly noted that the story of the king’s death indicates the source of ‘Herod’s’ persecution: ‘Herod’ rules under the authority of Satan. In this way, ‘Herod’ consistently appears as a hostile political ruler who seeks the deaths of the key leaders of the Jesus movement in Luke-Acts.

A King and Ruler Takes His Stand: ‘Herod’ in Luke-Acts

This chapter has examined the narrative characterisation of composite ‘Herod’. I began with Acts 4:25-27, demonstrating that this passage plays a programmatic role in the overall characterisation of ‘Herod’. In my exegesis of Acts 4:25-27, I have shown that Luke cites Psa 2:1-2, a psalm that exhibits synonymous parallelism, and structures his interpretation of the psalm so as to mirror that parallelism. This analysis allows me to understand Luke’s ‘Herod’ as a representative king *and* ruler in the narrative. In addition to viewing ‘Herod’ as king and ruler, I noted that opposition to the early church is rightly understood an extension and continuation of the opposition faced by Jesus in Luke’s passion narrative. Not only does Acts 4:25-27 recall Jesus’ passion, but also ‘Herod’s’ earlier antagonism toward both Jesus and John the Baptist in the third gospel. Finally, the

portrayal of the early church as interpreting the hostility it faced in this way anticipates ‘Herod’s’ later antagonism toward the church.

My interpretation of Acts 4:25-27 provided the platform for the analysis of composite ‘Herod’ as a character in relation to Luke’s central protagonists: John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles/early church. The story of ‘Herod’ and John that begins at Luke 1:5 continues as the recurrence of the name ‘Herod’ provides an *inclusio* for the narrative of John’s ministry in Luke 3:1-20. In the analysis of this passage I observed that of all the political leaders whose reigns provide the backdrop for the story of John (and the whole of his gospel), ‘Herod’ emerges from the group as the political antagonist of the Baptist. At Luke 3:18-20 I note that ‘Herod’ imprisoned John as a result of the Baptist’s proclamation of the good news to the ruler in the form of a rebuke. The story of ‘Herod’ and John ends when ‘Herod’ admits to having beheaded John. John, in his role as prophetic forerunner of the Messiah, prepares the way for Jesus. One way he prepares for Jesus is his death at the hands of ‘Herod’.

As with John and ‘Herod’, the narrative of Jesus and ‘Herod’ begins at Luke 1:5, a passage which my exegesis has shown presents ‘Herod’ as a rival king to Jesus, thus setting the tension that will intensify between the two characters throughout the narrative. Tension builds as ‘Herod’ desires to see Jesus after hearing rumours concerning Jesus’ teaching and miracles. Further specificity regarding this desire comes Luke 13:31 when a group of Pharisees inform Jesus of ‘Herod’s’ desire to kill him. ‘Herod’ had already killed John; there was nothing to stop the ruler from killing another prophet. I also explained how Luke 8:3 and Acts 13:1 provide part of the reason for ‘Herod’s’ lingering antagonism toward Jesus – his rejection of Jesus’

proclamation of the gospel. 'Herod' and Jesus finally meet in the Lukan passion narrative. Though 'Herod' is exceedingly glad to see Jesus, his gladness arose from the wrongheaded desire to see Jesus perform a miracle, a desire that Jesus does not fulfil. Additionally, Jesus refuses to respond to 'Herod's' lengthy interrogation, a further indication of the ruler's inability to hear the message proclaimed by Jesus. Jesus' refusal to provide 'Herod' with a miracle or a response to his questions leads to 'Herod's' contempt for and mockery of Jesus' purported kingship. In a seemingly anti-climactic move, 'Herod' sends Jesus back to Pilate, concurring with Pilate's assessment that Jesus had done nothing worthy of death. The tension between 'Herod' and Jesus reaches its *dénouement* at Acts 4:25-27 when 'Herod' is implicated in the death of Jesus.

'Herod's' hostility toward both John and Jesus foreshadows his persecution of the church, particularly the apostles James and Peter. The king's persecution of the church in Jerusalem is reminiscent of the narratives of 'Herod' and John and 'Herod' and Jesus. The king's execution of James recalls the execution of John in several ways. 'Herod's' imprisonment of Peter evokes the passion narrative and Acts 4:25-27. In the brief look at the scene of 'Herod's' death in light of Garrett's article, I noted the ways in which 'Herod' appears as an agent of Satan, thus corroborating the earlier portrayal of 'Herod' as a king/ruler who exercises authority delegated to him by the devil and providing the reason for 'Herod's' persistent rejection of the gospel and his antagonism toward those who proclaim it.

In chapter three I explored composite characters and explained that they appear in literary works when several distinct historic individuals are conflated into a single character. I have explored how this phenomenon occurs with the Herodian

rulers in the narrative of Luke-Acts, noting particularly the distinctive features in Luke 1:5 (the title 'King of Judaea') and Acts 12 (the name 'Herod' for Agrippa I) with the result that every occurrence of the name 'Herod' may be understood as referring to a single character. The conclusions of those earlier chapters resulted in the analysis undertaken in this chapter which has demonstrated that 'Herod' may be construed as a composite character. I now turn my attention to the matter of what is gained by understanding 'Herod' as a composite by situating this character in the Lukan narrative as a whole and relating the depiction of this character to the larger concerns and themes of Luke-Acts.

Chapter 6: ‘Herod’, Satan’s Authority, and the Proclamation of the Gospel

‘The plan of God cannot be blocked’.¹

We have now seen that one way of construing the depiction of the Herodian rulers in Luke-Acts is to view those who are named ‘Herod’ as a composite character. This chapter will explore what we gain by understanding ‘Herod’ as a composite, situating the portrayal of this character within the Lukan narrative as a whole. Specifically, I will show that composite ‘Herod’ embodies Satanic opposition to the proclamation of the gospel. In order to accomplish this I will first examine the proclamation of the gospel message from Jerusalem to Rome as a theme in Luke-Acts. Then I will briefly look at the depiction of the protagonists who interact with ‘Herod’ (John the Baptist, Jesus, the apostles, and the early church) as those who lead in proclaiming the gospel. Next, I will examine two facets of the portrayal of the devil/Satan in Luke-Acts: 1) the devil holds authority over the kingdoms of the inhabited world, i.e., the Roman Empire and 2) Satan’s attempts to impede the proclamation of the good news within the inhabited world. This will provide a framework for explaining ‘Herod’s’ antagonism toward Luke’s protagonists, namely, ‘Herod’ is a Roman ruler² who holds authority granted to him by the devil and

¹ Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, Rev. ed., Reading the New Testament (Macon: Smyth & Helwys Publishers, 2005), 198.

² See the inclusion of ‘Herod’ among the Roman rulers at Luke 3:1-2 and my comments on that passage above (pp. 118-121).

therefore acts in ways that work to hinder the outward expansion of the gospel message. We will see that though Luke's narrative portrayal of the Roman Empire is varied, 'Herod' exemplifies an extreme-negative in that depiction – that political persecution in the forms of imprisonment and death may come on those who proclaim the gospel.³

With these thematic observations in place, I will then return to the character 'Herod', examining the story of the death of 'Herod' (Acts 12:20-23), a story that concludes with the word of God growing and multiplying (Acts 12:24), thus illustrating that though political persecution is a reality in Luke's narrative, it does not hinder the spread of the gospel and, ironically, aids the Christian mission (cf. Acts 8:4). Further illustrating this reality, I will conclude this study by analysing Luke's characterisation of King Agrippa vis-à-vis Paul. I note that Paul is detained at 'Herod's' Praetorium in Caesarea (Acts 23:35). This is the final appearance of 'Herod' in Luke-Acts and casts an ominous tone over Paul's trials in Acts 24-26. Additionally, I will argue that Luke's portrayal of King Agrippa is remarkably similar to his depiction of 'Herod' in that Agrippa appears as a King who hears the

³ The extent of persecution for Luke, his readers, or even for the church as a whole in the first century is unknown and ultimately beyond our concern. Persecution of Christians was likely *not* widespread in the late first century, but instead probably limited to attacks against leaders of the nascent movement such as we see in Luke-Acts (and the early second century martyrs, e.g., Ignatius, Polycarp, etc.) and/or localised outbreaks such as the Book of Revelation reflects. Our concern here is that Luke creates a story world in which persecution happens and we will deal with it at that level. I employ the term 'persecution' here as a convenient, shorthand way to refer to the opposition, hostility, and antagonism faced by the protagonists of Luke-Acts from 'Herod' and others, specifically the imprisonment and death of several protagonists by 'Herod'. Candida Moss, *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 9–12 makes the point that in the period before 250 CE only local Roman officials persecuted Christians, which accords with Luke's portrayal of 'Herod' persecuting key individuals. See also Marta Sordi, *The Christians and the Roman Empire*, trans. Annabel Bedini (London: Croom Helm, 1983), 4–5; Christopher Bryan, *Render to Caesar: Jesus, the Early Church, and the Roman Superpower* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 89; Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982), 81, 96–97.

case of one of the central protagonists alongside a governor, he mocks the defendant (Acts 26:28), finds the defendant not guilty, and in the process fails to truly hear the good news that Paul has proclaimed. These realities, combined with the portentous setting at ‘Herod’s’ Praetorium, anticipates Paul’s imminent demise at Agrippa’s hands.⁴ Paul does not die, however, and the outcome of his trial before Agrippa illustrates the theme of this chapter: that Satanic opposition toward the spread of the gospel (in the form of political persecution) will not hinder the spread of the good news to the end of the earth. As other cases of opposition and persecution (including ‘Herod’s’) often abet the outward spread of the gospel, so Agrippa’s verdict in Paul’s case becomes the impetus for the final stage of the Christian mission to the end of the earth. This occurs in accordance with the promises made by the Lord concerning Paul that he would carry the name of Jesus before Gentiles and testify in Rome, though he would suffer while doing so (Acts 9:15-16; 23:11).⁵ In the Lukan narrative, political opposition is a reality, but it cannot stop the spread of the gospel to the end of the earth.

⁴ F. Scott Spencer, *Journeying through Acts: A Literary-Cultural Reading* (Peabody: Hendricksen, 2004), 235; Paul Schubert, ‘The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts,’ *JBL* 87 (1968): 11.

⁵ Matthew L. Skinner, *Locating Paul: Places of Custody as Narrative Settings in Acts 21-28*, *Academia Biblica* 13 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 94–97; Schubert, ‘Final Cycle,’ 7; David P. Moessner, ‘The Christ Must Suffer: New Light on the Jesus - Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts,’ *NovT* 28 (1986): 250–251; Richard I. Pervo, *Acts, Hermeneia* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 615; Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 589; Luke T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, SP 5 (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 443; Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 209.

Proclaiming the Gospel as a Theme in Luke-Acts

Aside from the broad assertion of Luke's preface to provide Theophilus with certainty about the things he had been taught (Luke 1:1-4), there is not a single, specific purpose for this *Doppelwerk*.⁶ Since that is the case, we would do well to consider the overarching themes in the Lukan writings, one of which is the proclamation of the good news to the end of the earth. This theme runs from the birth narratives of John the Baptist and Jesus through Paul's imprisonment in Rome. The angel informs Zechariah that John will go before Jesus as Elijah (Luke 1:17), a role John fulfils in Luke 3 as he comes *preaching the good news* (Luke 3:3, 18). Jesus' birth is announced as good news (Luke 2:10). In the programmatic scene in the Nazareth synagogue (Luke 4:18-19), Luke's Jesus applies the words of Isa 61:1-2 to his work, a work described as εὐαγγελίζω⁷ and κηρύσσω. These two terms overlap in Luke (cf. 4:18, 43-44; 8:1)⁸ and represent the preaching of protagonists in the third gospel. While preaching and proclaiming are not Jesus' only activities, a large part of the third gospel describes Jesus doing so, with Luke 4:18-19 subsuming healing miracles under the umbrella of proclaiming good news (cf. Luke 7:22). Jesus himself continues this proclamation in various towns (Luke 4:44; 8:1) and also sends out the twelve and a larger group of disciples of seventy or seventy-two disciples to proclaim good news (Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-12), prefiguring the mission the apostles and church

⁶ As Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel*, SNTSMS 78 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 136 states, 'In content this final clause is not very informative'. Raymond Pickett, 'Luke and Empire: An Introduction,' in *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, ed. David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee (Eugene: Pickwick, 2011), 7 states, 'There is no consensus about the purpose(s) or situation of Luke-Acts.'

⁷ As Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, AB 28 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), 148, 173 points out, Luke prefers the verb to the noun (εὐαγγέλιον).

⁸ LN 33.206-207, 215.

would undertake in the Book of Acts to all nations (Luke 24:47). Green states the case well,

...Luke uses this scene [Luke 10:1-12] to prepare for and anticipate a mission that is in the process of expanding beyond the land of the Jews. This is suggested by the number of important parallels between the sending of the seventy-two and the mission 'to the ends of the earth' as it is portrayed in Acts - for example, the thread that runs from the mission of John to the mission of the seventy-two to the mission of Jesus' followers in Acts, as well as the parallels between the forms of ministry ('in the name of Jesus') and anticipated reception of the seventy-two and their counterparts in Acts.⁹

In this way, Jesus' preaching continues with the preaching narrated in Acts, which is sometimes described as bearing witness to Jesus (Acts 1:8; 10:39-43; 13:30-32; cf. Luke 24:47-48).¹⁰ Acts 1 expounds the theme of Jesus' disciples as witnesses (i.e., those who will continue Jesus' work of proclamation) as the narrative implies that the second book will continue to tell of what Jesus began to do and to teach (Acts 1:1)¹¹ and narrates the resurrected Jesus' instructions to the eleven that they will receive power from the Holy Spirit to be his witnesses to the end of the earth (Acts 1:8).¹² This instruction sets the trajectory for the narrative of Acts. The disciples begin the world-wide spread of the good news in Jerusalem (Acts 1-7), continue

⁹ Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 411. See also Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 233.

¹⁰ See Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, Trans. by Goeffrey Buswell (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), 222. Seyoon Kim, *Christ and Caesar: The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the Writings of Paul and Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 151 notes that the object of preaching/proclamation is both the Kingdom of God and the Lord Jesus Christ as we will see below.

¹¹ Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary (Introduction and 1:1-2:47)*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 556; F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Third Revised and Enlarged Ed. (Leicester: Apollos, 1990), 98; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles*, AB 31 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 195; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles I-XIV*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 66-67; Beverley Roberts Gaventa, *Acts*, ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003), 34, 40, 63.

¹² Kim, *Christ and Caesar*, 151.

throughout Judaea and Samaria as a result of persecution (Acts 8), and to the end of the earth through the preaching of Peter (Acts 10-11, 15) and Paul (Acts 9, 13-28).

In the first twelve chapters of Acts, Peter is the main protagonist,¹³ taking the lead in proclaiming repentance for the forgiveness of sins in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2), repeatedly preaching despite threats from the Jerusalem authorities (Acts 3-5), commissioning those who will continue the work of Jesus and the apostles (Acts 6-8), and somewhat reluctantly pioneering the mission to the Gentiles (Acts 10-11). In these early chapters of Acts, other individuals, Stephen and Philip in particular, begin to take over the task of spreading the good news from the apostles (Acts 7-8).¹⁴ Beginning in Acts 13, Paul becomes the main protagonist¹⁵ and after the sending out of Paul and Barnabas by the church in Antioch, Paul's work is depicted as proclaiming the word of God (Acts 13:5).¹⁶ Paul's divinely guided (Acts 9:15; 19:21; 22:15, 21; 23:11; 27:24) ministry in Acts begins and ends with proclamation of the word of God and the Kingdom of God (Acts 9:20; 13:5; 28:30-31).¹⁷ Thus, it is evident that the proclamation of the good news is a central theme of the third gospel and Acts.

¹³ Pervo, *Acts*, 319; Gaventa, *Acts*, 54.

¹⁴ Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1990), 80; Spencer, *Journeying*, 77.

¹⁵ On the shift in narrative focus from Peter to Paul, see O. Wesley Allen, Jr., *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts*, SBLDS 158 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 130; Pervo, *Acts*, 319; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 2: 159; Spencer, *Journeying*, 140; Johnson, *Acts*, 225. Gaventa, *Acts*, 54-55 notes the shift from Peter to Paul but adds that this shift is not an appropriate way of understanding the structure of Acts.

¹⁶ John B. Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles*, BZNTW 131 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 215; Johnson, *Acts*, 226; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 435.

¹⁷ Johnson, *Acts*, 170. As Jerome Kodell, 'The Word of God Grew: The Ecclesial Tendency of Λόγος in Acts 1,7; 12,24; 19,20,' *Bib* 55 (1974): 507-509 writes, λογός in Acts is imprecise, referring to the gospel message, the Jesus event, and the Christian mission.

The Protagonists Proclaiming the Gospel

Each of the protagonists who face opposition from ‘Herod’ are depicted in Luke-Acts as proclaiming the gospel. Here I will present a short summary of the portrayal of these characters proclaiming the gospel, particularly with reference to ‘Herod’.¹⁸

John the Baptist

In Luke-Acts, John the Baptist serves as the inaugurator of Jesus’ ministry.¹⁹ John the Baptist is characterised in prophetic terms²⁰ (specifically reminiscent of Elijah),²¹ particularly the ‘Isaianic herald of redemption’.²² John’s ministry is summarised as proclaiming baptism for the forgiveness of sins (Luke 3:3; Acts 10:37). The two key terms κηρύσσω and εὐαγγελίζω (Luke 3:3, 18) provide a clear indication of the preparatory nature of John’s ministry and message not only for Jesus, but also for the disciples/apostles and the early Church in Acts.²³

¹⁸ Kim, *Christ and Caesar*, 159 discusses the proclamation of the good news to political rulers and points out that the conversion of political rulers is necessary 1) for their own salvation (cf. Acts 26:29) and 2) for the freedom of the Christian mission. However, the conversion of rulers is not essential for the success of the Christian mission as is patently evident in the case of ‘Herod’.

¹⁹ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 450–451; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989), 103–108. On the roles of John in the narrative of Luke-Acts aside from the one addressed here, see Robert L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet*, JSNTSS 62 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 60–70; John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*, JSNTSS 163 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 146–149.

²⁰ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 163–165.

²¹ Cf. Luke 1:17, 76; 7:26–27; Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 2nd ed. (London: Chapman, 1993), 389; Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian*, 108–109; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 24.

²² Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 170. Note Luke’s more extensive quotation of Isaiah 40:3–5 (Luke 3:4–6) whereas the other synoptics only cite Isa 40:3 (Mark 1:2–3; Matt 3:3).

²³ I. Howard Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 60–61, 135; John Nolland, *Luke 1:1–9:20*, WBC 35a (Waco: Word, 1989), 140–141; Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, SBLMS 20 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), 31. Contra Conzelmann, *Theology*, 23.

John the Baptist is the first character with whom ‘Herod’ interacts in Luke-Acts. In the previous chapter I noted that references to ‘Herod’ bracket John’s ministry (Luke 3:1, 18-20) and draw attention to this particular ruler as one who is hostile toward John the Baptist.²⁴ In the analysis of Luke 3:18-20; 9:7-9 above we saw that ‘Herod’s’ imprisonment and subsequent execution of John resulted from the Baptist’s rebuke of ‘Herod’ (we remember that Luke portrays John’s rebuke of ‘Herod’ as εὐαγγελίζω, cf. Luke 3:18) concerning an illicit marriage to his sister-in-law and ‘Herod’s’ nature as an evil-doer. Despite its brevity, the narrative of John’s ministry depicts John proclaiming the gospel, thereby contributing to this overarching theme as well as experiencing and foreshadowing the antagonistic role of ‘Herod’ in the narrative.

Jesus

Demonstrating continuity with the ministry of John the Baptist, Jesus’ ministry is defined by the terms κηρύσσω and εὐαγγελίζω found in the programmatic and political²⁵ statement of Luke 4:18-19.²⁶ Nolland highlights the programmatic nature of Luke 4:18-19 by noting how later occurrences of κηρύσσω and εὐαγγελίζω with reference to Jesus deliberately recall the episode in the Nazareth synagogue.²⁷

²⁴ Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 152; Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom, *The Roman Empire in Luke’s Narrative*, LNTS 404 (London: T & T Clark, 2010), 167–168.

²⁵ Steve Walton, ‘The State They Were In: Luke’s View of the Roman Empire,’ in *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*, ed. Peter Oakes (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002), 17–18. *Contra* Conzelmann, *Theology*, 139.

²⁶ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 149; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 207; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 195; Otto Betz, ‘The Kerygma of Luke,’ *Int* 22 (1968): 134.

²⁷ Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 216 and 365.

Luke 4:18 shows further continuity with John's message when the author describes the content of Jesus' proclamation as ἄφεσις for captives and the oppressed (cf. Luke 3:3). The content of Jesus' message adds to that of John as Jesus regularly proclaims the good news *of the Kingdom of God* (e.g., Luke 4:43; 8:1; 16:16).²⁸ We should understand the Kingdom of God in Jesus' preaching as a reference to the everlasting kingdom over which Jesus will rule (cf. Luke 1:32-33; in contrast to the kingdoms of the world ruled by Satan, cf. Luke 4:5-6)²⁹ and in light of Jesus' pronouncements and actions in the immediate context of Luke 4:18-19: acceptance and rejection (Luke 4:20-30), healing and exorcism (Luke 4:31-41), itinerant preaching and teaching (Luke 4:42-44), and calling disciples (Luke 5:1-11).³⁰ In other words, the coming of Jesus as the Messiah *is* the arrival of the Kingdom of God, realised through the various activities Jesus undertakes to initiate his ministry.³¹ In this way Jesus' proclamation of the good news is both an extension and development of John's preaching.³² John proclaimed a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. Jesus did not proclaim baptism, but often called people to repent and declared their sins forgiven (cf. Luke 5:20, 32; 7:48). This message is summed up in the phrase 'Kingdom of God'.

²⁸ See Graham Stanton, 'Message and Miracles,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 57 who states, 'The synoptic evangelists clearly imply that "kingdom of God" was the central theme of Jesus' message.'

²⁹ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 227, 603. On Satan's authority over the kingdoms of the world, see below.

³⁰ Cf. Luke 7:22; 9:11 where Luke's Jesus reports that these are features of his messianic work.

³¹ Cf. Luke 11:20; 17:20-21 and Betz, 'Kerygma,' 137. This does not preclude a future realisation of the kingdom that we see in e.g., Luke 11:2; 13:28-29. See Stanton, 'Message,' 57-61 on both the present and future aspects of the Kingdom of God in the synoptic tradition.

³² Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 51-52.

It is little wonder that ‘Herod’, the king and ruler over the territory in which Jesus was proclaiming this message, sought to kill the one announcing the arrival of another Kingdom. This recalls the tension that was set in the narrative of the birth of Jesus, the one destined to inherit David’s throne and rule over the house of Jacob forever, during the reign of ‘Herod’ the king (Luke 1:5). Also, as we have seen in the discussion of Luke 9:7-9 above, ‘Herod’ was perplexed by rumours of Jesus’ teaching, preaching, and miraculous activity, resulting in a desire to see Jesus (Luke 9:9) that was then described as a desire to kill Jesus (Luke 13:31). In other words, it was precisely Jesus’ proclamation of the good news of the Kingdom of God that prompted ‘Herod’s’ antagonism toward him.

Jesus’ ministry demonstrates continuity with and development beyond John the Baptist’s. This development continues as Jesus’ disciples are sent out to proclaim repentance, forgiveness (Luke 24:47), and the Kingdom of God (Acts 8:12; 28:31). However, a new development in the content of the church’s preaching in Acts is a focus on the person of Jesus himself. While undertaking this task, the apostles and the early church face ‘Herod’ just as John and Jesus did.

The Apostles and the Church

In several ways, the message proclaimed by the apostles and earliest Christians in Luke-Acts mirrors that of Jesus. The same key vocabulary describes their proclamation (κηρύσσω and εὐαγγελίζω) and specifically mentions repentance, forgiveness of sins (Luke 24:47), and the Kingdom of God (Acts 8:12; 20:25; 28:31) as the content of their preaching. Prefiguring the church’s proclamation is the

mission of the twelve (Luke 9:1-6) and the seventy (Luke 10:1-12, 17-20).³³ In both of these prefiguring narratives, Jesus sent disciples out to proclaim the arrival of the Kingdom of God and to perform healing miracles (Luke 9:2, 6; 10:9, 11), the very same actions that Luke depicts Jesus as doing. However, just as there was development in the proclamation from John to Jesus, so there is also from Jesus to the apostles and early Christians.³⁴ Not only do Jesus' followers replicate his preaching and some of his miracles, but Jesus *himself* becomes a new aspect of their proclamation as they preach the person (Acts 5:42; 8:5, 35; 9:20; 10:42; 11:20; 17:18; 19:13), name (Acts 4:12; 8:12), and/or work of Jesus (Acts 10:36; 17:18).³⁵

By the time of 'Herod's' persecution of the apostles and the Jerusalem church (Acts 12:1-18), the narrative has recounted the outward expansion of the gospel in accordance with the programmatic instructions of Jesus at Acts 1:8. The first step in this outward expansion came as the result of the persecution surrounding Stephen's death (Acts 8:1). Accordingly, 'Herod's' persecution and subsequent death is the impetus for the continued spread of the gospel to the end of the earth (Acts 12:24-25). The story of 'Herod's' persecution of the church and his death occurs between the stories of the first mass incorporation of Gentiles (Ἑλληνιστάς, Acts 11:20)³⁶ into the church at Antioch (Acts 11:19-26) and the church's commission of Saul and Barnabas for the task appointed to them by the Lord (Acts 13:1-3), the mission to the

³³ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 411; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 233.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 51-52.

³⁵ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 342. In two instances (Acts 8:4; 15:35) λόγος describes the content of proclamation and refers to the person, name, and/or work of Jesus as well.

³⁶ The narrative has progressed beyond the initial stages of the outward spread of the gospel with the Jerusalem church's consent to the Gentile acceptance of the gospel based on Peter's report regarding Cornelius' household (Acts 11:18).

Gentiles (cf. Acts 9:15-16).³⁷ We have seen above in our discussion of ‘Herod’ as a character in Acts 12 that his actions were motivated by his belief that the church posed a political threat,³⁸ a belief prompted by the church proclaiming the good news.³⁹ The narrative placement of ‘Herod’s’ persecution and death in this narrative context clarifies the ruler’s antagonism toward the church, James, and Peter. The church in Acts is an extension of the person ‘Herod’ sought to see and kill, particularly in its proclamation of the Kingdom of God and of Jesus, which the narrative indicates that ‘Herod’ had heard (Acts 13:1; cf. Luke 8:3; 9:7-9) and rejected (Luke 13:31; 23:6-12; cf. 3:19-20).⁴⁰ At Acts 12, as the church begins to expand its numbers beyond the borders of Israel, ‘Herod’ seeks to quell this expansion of the group that proclaims an alternate Kingdom by attacking it and its leaders. Meanwhile, the church’s other enemies, the Jews, express their pleasure at ‘Herod’s’ actions, which only serves to further motivate the King in his attempts to squash the church.

We have now established that the proclamation of the good news is an overarching theme in the narrative and have seen how each of the protagonists who interact with ‘Herod’ contribute to that theme. The protagonists’ proclamation of the gospel prompts ‘Herod’s’ hostility toward them. In seeking to explain the role of

³⁷ Johnson, *Acts*, 225; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 496.

³⁸ See above and cf. Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 574–575; Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 385.

³⁹ Though, as C. Kavin Rowe, *World Upside Down* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 5, 91, 136 rightfully points out, Luke holds in tension the portrayal of the church’s opponents believing that Christians are a political threat while depicting Christians as innocent and non-threatening to the Roman government/state.

⁴⁰ Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, 206–207 states that Herod’s execution of James and imprisonment of Peter are threats made to the very existence of the church.

‘Herod’ in relation to this theme specifically, we now turn our attention to the portrayal of the Roman Empire and its rulers under the authority of the devil who seeks to impede the spread of the gospel. This will allow us to understand the portrayal of ‘Herod’ as a Roman ruler whose hostility toward the protagonists of Luke-Acts may be explained as an extension of Satan’s attempts to hinder the proclamation of the gospel.

Satan’s Authority and the Roman Empire in Luke-Acts

Surveys of scholarship on the question of Luke’s view of the Roman Empire are readily available, leaving no need to present another here.⁴¹ At this juncture we note the trend in scholarship to move past the vacillation between the several options concerning the political outlook of Luke-Acts – *apologia pro imperio*,⁴² *apologia pro ecclesia*,⁴³ anti-imperial,⁴⁴ or apolitical⁴⁵ – to more nuanced and balanced views that attempt to account for varied pieces of evidence regarding the depiction of the Empire, Imperial rulers, and Christian responses to Imperial rule found in

⁴¹ Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 53–55 and notes; Walton, ‘State They Were In,’ 2–12; Alexandru Neagoe, *The Trial of the Gospel: An Apologetic Reading of Luke’s Trial Narrative*, SNTSMS 116 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 4–21.

⁴² E.g., Paul W. Walasky, *And So We Came to Rome: The Political Perspective of St. Luke*, SNTSMS 49 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Maddox, *Purpose*.

⁴³ E.g., Conzelmann, *Theology*.

⁴⁴ Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*. See Yong-Sung Ahn, *The Reign of God and Rome in Luke’s Passion Narrative: An East Asian Global Perspective* (Leiden: Brill, 2006) for a post-colonial perspective.

⁴⁵ Sordi, *Christians and Roman Empire*; Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*, *Theology of the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Klaus Wengst, *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1987), 100.

Luke-Acts.⁴⁶ In situating ‘Herod’ in this discussion, I agree with several scholars on a key point regarding the view of the Empire in the narrative outlook of Luke-Acts: the Roman Empire, as the backdrop of his narrative (cf. Luke 1:5; 2:1-2; 3:1-2),⁴⁷ exists under the authority of the devil/Satan, putting the Empire and its rulers in a negative light in Luke-Acts.⁴⁸

The key text in this regard is Luke 4:5-6,⁴⁹ the devil’s second temptation of Jesus. We must remember that, as Bovon states, the political dimension of this text is secondary to the theological dimension, but it is present nonetheless.⁵⁰ In the Lukan narrative the devil is in a position of authority over the kingdoms of the world, i.e.,

⁴⁶ Philip F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, SNTSMS 57 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Walton, ‘State They Were In’; Bryan, *Render to Caesar*; Pickett, ‘Luke and Empire,’ 6; Barbara Reid, ‘Women Prophets of God’s Alternative Reign,’ in *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, ed. David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee (Eugene: Pickwick, 2011), 47; Vernon K. Robbins, ‘Luke-Acts: A Mixed Population Seeks a Home in the Roman Empire,’ in *Images of Empire*, ed. Loveday Alexander, JSOTSS (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 202; Maddox, *Purpose*, 95. Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 4 notes the impasse that scholars have reached by believing that Acts speaks plainly about politics and 207, n. 2 laments that Lukan scholars have not moved far beyond the configurations of Luke and Empire proposed by Conzelmann and Haenchen.

⁴⁷ Luke T. Johnson, *Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 49, 64.

⁴⁸ Kim, *Christ and Caesar*, 147; Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 201–202; Maddox, *Purpose*, 95; Archie Penner, *The Christian, The State, and The New Testament* (Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1959), 37; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 194–195. This is contrary to those who believe that the depiction of the Empire is generally positive in Luke-Acts, such as those who hold the *apologia pro Imperio* view and e.g., Robert F. O’Toole, ‘Luke’s Position on Politics and Society in Luke-Acts,’ in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, ed. Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983), 1–17; Wengst, *Pax Romana*, 89–100.

⁴⁹ Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 69.

⁵⁰ Francois Bovon, *Luke I*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002), 144 notes the specific theological concern in this passage: the temptation of Jesus to gain power through misdirected worship. J. Duncan M. Derrett, ‘Luke’s Perspective on Tribute to Caesar,’ in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, ed. Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983), 2 also cautions that any understanding of Luke’s attitude about politics must be part of his deeper theological concerns. Finally C. Kevin Rowe, ‘Luke-Acts and the Imperial Cult: A Way Through the Conundrum,’ *JSNT* 27 (2003): 299 writes, ‘As a whole, however, Luke is far more concerned with the story of Jesus and the church than with the narration of particular incidents that deal unambiguously with Rome.’

the Roman Empire, a position that was given to him by God.⁵¹ Two factors highlight the political aspect of the passage. First, the devil shows Jesus *πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης*. *Ἡ οἰκουμένη* is the inhabited world, i.e., the Roman Empire, in Luke-Acts (Luke 2:1; cf. Luke 21:26; Acts 11:28; 17:6, 31; 19:27; 24:5).⁵² This Empire is comprised of multiple *βασιλείας*,⁵³ and it is into this Empire that the Lukan protagonists come proclaiming the good news of another Kingdom, thereby creating inevitable conflict between kingdoms such as that envisioned by Luke 1:5, 32-33 with both ‘Herod’ and Jesus portrayed as kings.⁵⁴ Second, in Luke 4:5-6 we also learn that the devil holds *ἐξουσία* over the kingdoms of the Empire, authority that has been entrusted to him (*ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται*) and that he can give to whomever he desires (*ἐὰν θέλω δίδωμι αὐτοῖς*).⁵⁵ Entrusted authority over kingdoms connotes the delegation of power and here again we see a direct conflict with the Kingdom proclaimed by Jesus, a Kingdom that is gained not by power but through self-sacrifice (cf. Luke 22:24-29).⁵⁶ ‘Herod’ is one who holds *ἐξουσία*, but before we show that ‘Herod’s’ antagonism toward the protagonists derives from his role as a

⁵¹ Heinz Kruse, ‘Das Reich Satans,’ *Bib* 58 (1977): 47, 50; Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 90; Kim, *Christ and Caesar*, 88; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 143, n. 40; Johnson, *Luke*, 74; John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary*, The New Testament Library (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 103; Richard B. Vinson, ‘The Minas Touch: Anti-Kingship Rhetoric in the Gospel of Luke,’ *PRSt* 35 (2008): 83–84. On the contrary, Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 516 believes that an allusion to the Empire here is unclear.

⁵² This differs from Matthew’s *ὁ κόσμος* (Matt 4:8) indicating something more specific.

⁵³ Kruse, ‘Das Reich Satans,’ 47–48.

⁵⁴ As further evidence of this conflict Johnson, *Luke*, 74 discusses the dispute between Jesus and two unknown groups of challengers concerning the casting out of demons by Beelzebul and the demand for a sign, highlighting the confrontation between God’s Kingdom and the kingdom(s) of Satan in the narrative (Luke 11:14-23). Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 43–46 notes that the scene of Acts 19:21-41 shows the collision between kingdoms of God and Satan, evidenced by the Ephesians’ turning from idol-based business at the proclamation of the gospel.

⁵⁵ See Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 91–93.

⁵⁶ Kim, *Christ and Caesar*, 89–90; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 180; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 143.

Roman ruler under Satan's authority we must examine the depiction of the devil's attempts to hinder the proclamation of the gospel.

Satan's Attempts to Hinder the Spread of the Gospel in Luke-Acts

Johnson writes, '...the proclamation of the kingdom of God involves a battle with and a victory over the counter-kingdom under the *exousia* of Satan.'⁵⁷ We note that the first appearance of the devil in the narrative is in the scene of Jesus' temptation in the wilderness (Luke 4:1-13). In this pericope, the devil attempts to undermine Jesus' status as the Son of God (cf. Luke 3:21-22, 38; 4:3, 9) thereby derailing the mission he will announce in the following story (cf. Luke 4:16-21).⁵⁸ Highlighting the competing aims of Jesus and the devil, the devil/Satan is the agent of people's physical afflictions (Luke 13:16; Acts 10:38),⁵⁹ which stands in direct conflict with Jesus' mission of proclaiming good news to those who are captive and oppressed (Luke 4:18-19). Further, in the Lukan version of the parable of the sower and its explanation (Luke 8:4-15), Jesus states that the devil takes the word of God that had been sown in the hearts of hearers so that those listeners may not believe and be saved (Luke 8:12).⁶⁰ I agree with Green who states that the interpretation of this parable 'highlights the ongoing presence of an aim (or aims) that opposes the

⁵⁷ Johnson, *Acts*, 437. Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 91, writing of the tension inherent in the narrative of Acts, states that the Christian mission collides with Gentile culture in such a way that though Christians are not seeking to overthrow the Empire, they are perceived as a threat to the Gentile way of life in the world.

⁵⁸ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 506; Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 191; Nolland, *Luke 1:1--9:20*, 182–183.

⁵⁹ Bovon, *Luke 1*, 141.

⁶⁰ Here Luke changes Mark's ὁ σατανᾶς to ὁ διάβολος and adds the purpose clause ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν. Matthew has ὁ πονηρός (Matt 13:19). See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 713–714 on Luke's redaction of Mark at this point.

purpose of God.’⁶¹ Green continues by noting how this foreshadows the opposition that Jesus eventually faces from the Jewish leadership through the person of Judas, whom Luke tells us εἰσῆλθεν σατανᾶς (Luke 22:3), leading to the arrest and crucifixion of Jesus.⁶² Fitzmyer’s assessment of the devil is *apropos*: the devil ‘sums up all opposition to the good that comes in Jesus, his word, his disciples or their mission.’⁶³

Several passages in Luke-Acts demonstrate that the proclamation of the gospel undermines the authority of Satan. The Lukan Jesus states that he saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven as a result of the preaching and healing mission of the seventy disciples (Luke 10:18).⁶⁴ This is not a final blow as the devil remains active in both the third gospel and Acts.⁶⁵ Therefore, it is best to understand Jesus’ statement here concerning the victory over Satan accomplished in the preaching and healing work of the seventy as representing in a small way the victory over the powers of darkness envisioned by the narrative as the gospel proceeds unhindered to the end of the earth.⁶⁶ In Satan’s final appearance in the narrative at Acts 26:18, the cosmic conflict involved in proclaiming the gospel comes into focus.⁶⁷ Paul, recounting his own conversion during his defence speech before King Agrippa, tells of the risen Jesus appointing him as a witness, sending him to open the eyes of

⁶¹ Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 328.

⁶² Ibid., 328 and 328, n. 40. This is likely the καιρός of Luke 4:13 (see Ibid., 753). We may also note here the attempt by Satan to sift Peter like wheat (and perhaps other disciples as well given the plural ὑμεῖς in Luke 22:31, but note the singular σοῦ in 22:32).

⁶³ Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian*, 147.

⁶⁴ The time and nature of Satan’s fall in this instance is a secondary concern at this point.

⁶⁵ Bovon, *Luke 1*, 141.

⁶⁶ Marshall, *Luke*, 429.

⁶⁷ Johnson, *Acts*, 437.

Gentiles, turning them from the authority of Satan to God.⁶⁸ Here we remember the devil's claim to hold authority over the kingdoms of the earth (Luke 4:5-6) and see clearly that Paul understands his apostolic mission as directly undermining the authority of Satan in the world.⁶⁹

All of these passages demonstrate that the devil, as one who holds authority over the inhabited world, desires to inhibit the proclamation of the gospel. This is apparent in the conflict between two competing kingdoms and the opposition faced by those who proclaim the gospel. The entire thrust of the narrative, especially the conclusion (Acts 28:30-31), demonstrates the failure of the devil in his attempts.

An explanation for 'Herod's' antagonism is now coming into view. As we proceed we will recall two points that have been made in the comments on Luke 3:1-2 and 23:7 in the previous chapter, that 'Herod' is a Roman ruler who holds authority in the world. We will couple that with the ideas surveyed in this chapter in order to explain the nature of 'Herod's' hostility toward John the Baptist, Jesus, the apostles, and the early church. In particular I will argue that 'Herod's' antagonism arises as a result of his reign as king and ruler under the authority of the devil. Thus, 'Herod's' hostility toward the protagonists – rejection of their message, imprisonment, execution – will be shown to be one way Satan attempts to hinder the spread of the good news.

⁶⁸ Robert F. O'Toole, *Acts 26: The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense (Ac 22:1-26:32)*, *Analecta Biblica* 78 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 73. Gaventa, *Acts*, 344-345 points out that this is the only place in Luke-Acts that believers are said to turn *from* Satan and that this concept is central to Luke's understanding of salvation.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 75–76. Luke has described the preaching of Paul and his companions as disturbing (Ἀναστατόω, Acts 17:6) and κινουῶντα στάσεις (Acts 24:5) the οἰκουμένη, the realm under the devil's authority (Acts 17:6; 24:5).

'Herod' as Roman Ruler under Satanic Dominion

The narrative portrayal of 'Herod' as a Roman political ruler provides the key to understanding the king/ruler's hostility. Our analysis of the depiction of 'Herod' above has shown an alignment of this character with the other Roman political entities in the narrative by the inclusion of 'Herod' in synchronisms of the third gospel (Luke 1:5; 3:1-2).⁷⁰ Emerging from the inclusion of 'Herod' in the synchronisms is the close narrative alignment of 'Herod' and Pilate in Luke-Acts (cf. Luke 13:1, 31; 23:1-15; Acts 4:27), the focus of which is their interaction during Jesus' trial.⁷¹ In fact, we need to recall our starting point (Acts 4:25-27) and the exegesis there showing 'Herod' to be both king and ruler.⁷² 'Herod's' status as king and ruler implies that he reigns over a kingdom, which is Judaea/Galilee (Luke 1:5; 3:1), and rules that kingdom with authority (ἐξουσία; Luke 23:7). We remember that the devil holds ἐξουσία over τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης...ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται καὶ ὃ ἐὰν θέλω δίδωμι αὐτῇν (Luke 4:5-6).⁷³ 'This implies that the princes receive power and glory neither directly from God nor from the people, but from the

⁷⁰ I refer the reader to my discussion of those passages in the previous chapter and Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 71–74; Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 58–59, 201; Reid, 'Women Prophets,' 45; Jae Won Lee, 'Pilate and the Crucifixion of Jesus in Luke-Acts,' in *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, ed. David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 94; Robbins, 'Mixed Population,' 206.

⁷¹ The Jewish leaders who accuse Jesus, Christians, and Paul, may also be viewed as part of the Roman political setting given the inclusion of the high priests in the synchronism at Luke 3:1-2, their trials of the accused at various points in the story, and their working alongside the Roman rulers to whom they appeal for ultimate decisions in cases. On this relationship between the Jewish leadership and the Imperial authorities, see Ahn, *Reign of God*, 175; Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 164.

⁷² For 'Herod' cf. Luke 1:5; 3:1; 9:7; Acts 4:26-27; 12:1; 13:1. For others cf. e.g., Luke 3:1-2; Acts 17:7; 19:31; 23:10; 25:24.

⁷³ Ahn, *Reign of God*, 160.

devil...'.⁷⁴ The reason for 'Herod's' antagonism toward the Lukan protagonists is now evident: 'Herod', as a Roman political ruler with authority, rules under the ultimate authority of the devil, who is the source of opposition toward the proclamation of the gospel in the narrative of Luke-Acts.

The Role of 'Herod' as a Composite Character

At this point we need to revisit briefly the discussion of composite characters in order to describe their function in the literature in which they appear.⁷⁵ Composite characters amalgamate features of historical individuals but transcend those individuals so that they appear as single characters that serve stereotypical, illustrative roles in a narrative. So, for example, given the paradigmatic nature of the Exodus narratives for Jews, with Pharaoh leading Egypt in the oppression of God's people, some Jewish writings capitalise on this image and include an unidentifiable 'Pharaoh' who had 'transcended history and personified the arch-enemy of Yahweh and his chosen people.'⁷⁶ Similarly, over time 'Nebuchadnezzar' came to represent a destroyer of God's people, a symbol of exile and oppression.⁷⁷ 'Mary' in early Christian and Gnostic texts represents a certain form of faithful discipleship, e.g., a comforter and teacher in the *Gospel of Mary* or a commissioned travelling and

⁷⁴ Ibid.; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 144.

⁷⁵ See chapter three above on the methodological considerations for this thesis. Here we will deal only with the true composites discussed above, not the confusion surrounding certain proper names or the other anomalous figures that authors sometimes employ to replace one character with another.

⁷⁶ John Barclay Burns, 'Pharaoh in the Old Testament: A Literary Degradation,' *Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 7 (1987): 20; Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 35. The exceptions are the named Pharaohs of 2 Kings and Jeremiah.

⁷⁷ Ronald Sack, *Images of Nebuchadnezzar: The Emergence of a Legend*, 2nd rev. and exp. ed. (London: Associated University Presses, 2004), 103–108 and 161, n. 35; Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 39.

teaching companion of Philip in the *Acts of Philip*.⁷⁸ Or ‘Philip’, as an amalgamation of the apostle and evangelist, represents a properly ascetic, itinerant, apostolic ministry of teaching and baptising in the *Acts of Philip*.⁷⁹ What stereotypical, illustrative role does ‘Herod’ fill in Luke-Acts?

In the Lukan narrative, composite ‘Herod’ represents an actualisation of Satan’s desire to impede the spread of the good news through his rejection of the gospel message and through political persecution. As we have seen, ‘Herod’ clearly rejects the good news proclaimed by the protagonists thereby impeding the progress of the gospel to the end of the earth. ‘Herod’, however, goes beyond mere personal rejection of the message to blatant persecution of the messengers, including the imprisonment and execution of those who preach the gospel. ‘Herod’s’ imprisonment and beheading of John (Luke 3:19-20; 9:9), his desire to see Jesus (Luke 9:9⁸⁰), his mockery of Jesus (Luke 23:11), his responsibility for Jesus’ death (Acts 4:27), his execution of James (Acts 12:2), and his intended execution of Peter (Acts 12:3-4) all show that this particular character acts in accord with the devil to hinder the spread of the gospel. Jesus’ warning regarding the political persecution his disciples may face (Luke 21:12) is evocative of ‘Herod’s’ actions: laying on hands (ἐπιβάλλω τὰς χεῖρας, cf. Acts 12:1), handing over to prisons (παραδίδωμι⁸¹ εἰς τὰς φυλακάς, cf.

⁷⁸ Ann Graham Brock, *Mary Magdalene, The First Apostle: The Struggle for Authority*, HTS 51 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 124–125.

⁷⁹ Christopher R. Matthews, *Philip: Apostle and Evangelist*, SupNovT 105 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 197.

⁸⁰ This is defined as a desire to kill Jesus at 13:31 and a desire to see a sign at 23:8 (cf. Luke 11:29), both of which are evil.

⁸¹ As Walton, ‘State They Were In,’ 20 points out, Luke uses this term more than twenty times to indicate opposition and hostility. Pickett, ‘Luke and Empire,’ 6, fn. 16 follows Walton. Here we disagree with Bryan, *Render to Caesar*, 47 who suggests that Luke 21:12 does not predict persecution by or conflict with Roman officials, but only the adjudication of cases by the rulers. Rather, in light of Luke 21:12, we must understand the appearances of characters before rulers as persecution (διώκω) within the Lukan narrative. As Scott Cunningham, *Through Many Tribulations: The Theology of*

Luke 3:20; Acts 12:4), and being led before kings (ἀπάγω ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς, cf. Acts 12:4 [ἀνάγω]).⁸² Luke 21:12 recalls another warning that echoes Luke's depiction of 'Herod', Luke 12:11: τὰς ἀρχάς (cf. Acts 4:26-27; Luke 3:1; 9:7) and τὰς ἐξουσίας (cf. Luke 23:7).⁸³ Such persecution, imprisonments, and trials are opportunities for further proclamation.⁸⁴ Cunningham states in his comments on Acts 14:22 (and in agreement with Haenchen), 'But, while tribulation is not the total expression for the disciples, it is portrayed in this passage as a feature inherent to the Christian life and is particularly linked by the context to mission activity.'⁸⁵ Proclaiming the gospel and the ensuing persecution are cyclical in Luke-Acts; preaching brings persecution which results in increased opportunities for preaching (cf. Acts 8:4; 12:24). In this way, composite 'Herod' plays an important role, providing a focal point around which the concepts of proclaiming the gospel to the inhabited world and the devil's opposition to that proclamation through the means of political persecution that sometimes befalls those who preach the gospel. Tannehill's assessment of Luke's portrayal of Herod Antipas in the passion narrative applies to composite 'Herod' not

Persecution in Luke-Acts, JSNTSS 142 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 128 points out, Luke's redaction of Mark 13:10, 13 at Luke 21:12 indicates that he envisions this sort of persecution occurring before the end times (πρὸ δὲ τούτων πάντα). Luke includes this word in two of his passion predictions (Luke 9:44; 18:32) and given 'Herod's' involvement in the trial of Jesus, we may view this as applying to him as well.

⁸² On the Herods in Luke-Acts as kings in light of Luke's generally negative portrayal of kings see Vinson, 'Minas Touch,' 77–78. Jesus is also led to (ἀγώ) and from (ἀπάγω) his trial before Pilate the governor (ἡγεμὼν, cf. Luke 3:1) and 'Herod', a king (cf. Luke 1:5; Acts 4:26-27; 12:1) at Luke 23:1, 26.

⁸³ Cunningham, *Tribulations*, 127–130. Cunningham also shows how Luke's vocabulary at this point looks forward to several scenes in Acts (4:3; 5:18; 21:27). Also see Steve Walton, 'What Does "Mission" in Acts Mean in Relation to the "Powers That Be"?,' *JETS* 55 (2012): 548–549 on the connection between Luke 12:12 and 21:12.

⁸⁴ Kim, *Christ and Caesar*, 157.

⁸⁵ Cunningham, *Tribulations*, 247. Cunningham refers to Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 436 who writes, '...persecution is to be the lot not only of Apostles but of Christians in general.' See also Maddox, *Purpose*, 82.

only over against Jesus, but also ‘Herod’s’ persecution of the other protagonists.

Tannehill states,

Thus not only religious but also political authorities reject Jesus in the passion story. The narrator could not make this so clear in the case of Pilate as he does with Herod, not only because Christians had to continue to live under Roman rule, but also because Pilate was needed to play another role: that of the official proclaimer of Jesus’ innocence.⁸⁶

Additionally, composite ‘Herod’ contributes to our understanding of the view of the Empire under the authority of the devil in the Lukan narrative.⁸⁷ I reiterate, Luke-Acts is neither pro- nor anti-Rome, offering an apology neither for the church to the Empire nor for the Empire to the church. I also do not want to make the mistake of allowing one character such as ‘Herod’ stand for the narrative view of Rome *in toto*. The depiction of Rome and its rulers in this narrative is varied and ultimately subject to larger theological concerns, in this case the cosmic conflict evidenced in the devil’s opposition to the proclamation of the gospel in the Empire over which he holds authority. The Roman Empire, as a manifestation of the devil’s authority in Luke’s story, thus provides the space in which John, Jesus, and the church proclaim the gospel, playing out the cosmic conflict, encountering both acceptance and resistance in the process.⁸⁸ ‘Herod’, as Roman ruler, does not respond

⁸⁶ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 1: 197. I agree with this assessment by Tannehill, which highlights the positive aspect of Luke’s portrayal of Pilate. I would add that Luke’s depiction of Pilate as a representative king/ruler alongside ‘Herod’ and as failing to act justly with respect to Jesus’ innocence (Luke 23:25; cf. Acts 3:13) serve to cast the governor in a negative light.

⁸⁷ Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 207, n.1; Neagoe, *Trial of the Gospel*, 39. On the Herodian rulers in particular see Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 163–198; Richard J Cassidy, *Society and Politics in The Acts of the Apostles* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1987), 1.

⁸⁸ As Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 186 argues, the political and cosmic dimensions are inseparable in the Lukan narrative. See also Steve Walton, ‘Trying Paul or Trying Rome?’, in *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, ed. David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 141; Reid, ‘Women Prophets,’ 47. Contra Bryan, *Render to Caesar*, 101 who writes, ‘For Luke, the Roman Empire in itself is not an obstacle to the spreading of

rightly to the good news and goes beyond mere resistance to its proclamation.

‘Herod’, perhaps more than any character in the narrative, and certainly more than any other ruler in the narrative, exhibits the desire of the devil to hinder the proclamation of the gospel through his explicit antagonism toward Luke’s central protagonists. In this way, he contributes to the negative assessment of the ruling powers in Luke-Acts.

The argument of this chapter thus far has been that the cosmic conflict between Satan and God takes on a specifically political nature in the character of ‘Herod’ and his opposition toward the central protagonists of the narrative of Luke-Acts. As scholarship on the question of Luke-Acts and the Roman Empire has moved beyond several polarised foci, we must place our conclusions regarding composite ‘Herod’ on a spectrum of depictions of Rome and its rulers that runs from favourable (e.g., Sergius Paulus, Paul the Roman citizen, an overarching mission that includes the Gentiles), to ambiguous (e.g., Festus),⁸⁹ to negative. Composite ‘Herod’, as one who rejects the good news and seeks to impede its outward spread, falls at the negative end of this spectrum, the extreme-negative. Such a character illustrates a key theme in the narrative, i.e., that as the Christian mission progresses, those who preach the gospel may encounter Satanic opposition to their proclamation in the form of political persecution such as that embodied by composite ‘Herod’. However, such opposition will not hinder the further spread of the good news as the two final appearances of ‘Herod’ in the narrative demonstrate.

the Good News’. This does no justice to the fact that certain Imperial representatives do, in fact, hinder the spread of the gospel. Similarly, Robbins, ‘Mixed Population,’ 207.

⁸⁹ Gaventa, *Acts*, 338.

The Death of 'Herod': The Word of God Continued to Grow and Multiply

The short, vivid scene of 'Herod's' death in Acts 12:20-24 presents the final aspects of the characterisation of 'Herod' and draws together the themes we have explored in this chapter. In a scene shift, 'Herod's' leaves Judaea to go to Caesarea (Acts 12:19), a locale that plays an important role in the Book of Acts and recalls the Imperial context in the narrative.⁹⁰ As Allen has noted, it is remarkable that Acts 12:20-23 is the only scene in the Book of Acts that does not involve any Christians.⁹¹ However, this fact does not diminish the significance of the scene because the death of 'Herod' signifies two realities in Luke-Acts: 1) through the death, the central, representative political opponent of the Jesus movement is removed⁹² and 2) given 'Herod's' representative role, this scene indicates that though political opposition is a reality the church may face, perhaps including the execution of its leaders,⁹³ persecution will not hinder the spread of the word of God.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ Johnson, *Acts*, 181. Cf. Acts 18:22; 21:8, 16; 23:23, 33; 25:1, 4, 6, 13.

⁹¹ Allen, Jr., *Death of Herod*, 3.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 91.

⁹³ Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts*, Paideia (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 172.

⁹⁴ I agree with Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 107, who states, 'The first story about Herod (Acts 12:1-19) has at its point that unrighteous rulers cannot stop the progress of the gospel.' Also Alan J. Thompson, *One Lord, One People: The Unity of the Church in Acts in Its Literary Setting*, LNTS 359 (London: T & T Clark, 2008), 141. There is much information that lies behind the scene of Acts 12:20-23 that Luke leaves untold: the cause of Herod's anger with Tyre and Sidon, how the Tyrian/Sidonian delegation persuaded Blastus to (presumably) assuage the king's anger, the nature of Tyre and Sidon's dependence on Herod's territory for food, and what Herod said in his address to the people. See Pervo, *Acts*, 313-314. One additional matter that scholars address is the relation of the current pericope to the story of Agrippa's death in Jos. *Ant.* 19.343-350, a matter that presents important historical and intertextual issues but is ultimately beyond the scope of this thesis. On the relationship between the accounts in Acts and Josephus see Daniel Schwartz, *Agrippa I: The Last King of Judaea*, TSAJ 23 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990), 145-149; Allen, Jr., *Death of Herod*, 66-74; Pervo, *Acts*, 312-313. The conclusions reached regarding the relationship between Acts 12:20-23 and the passage from Josephus largely depend on the degree to which a particular scholar is either critical of or apologetic toward the accounts in Josephus and Acts. I concur with Susan Garrett, 'Exodus from Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1-24,' *CBQ* 52 (1990): 676 who states that the differences between the accounts reflect the theological emphases of their respective authors.

The scene begins by relating ‘Herod’s’ intense anger with the cities of Tyre and Sidon. Θυμομαχέω is a NT *hapax* and is also quite rare in literature contemporaneous with Luke-Acts.⁹⁵ The word seems to connote rage, violence, and fury, all of which would be emotions consistent with how Luke has depicted ‘Herod’ elsewhere.⁹⁶ The issue between ‘Herod’ and the cities is resolved quickly in the narrative. The delegation persuades Blastus and presumably appeases the King who delivers an address to them (Acts 12:21).

Two of ‘Herod’s’ actions precede his delivering the address to the delegation from Tyre and Sidon.⁹⁷ First, ‘Herod’ clothes himself with ἐσθῆτα βασιλικήν.⁹⁸ We have encountered similar clothing already when ‘Herod’ mockingly clothed Jesus in ἐσθῆτα λαμπράν (Luke 23:11). As I noted above, apart from Jesus and ‘Herod’ the only others in Luke-Acts who wear ἐσθῆς are angelic beings (Luke 24:4; Acts 1:10; 10:30). When viewed from the perspective of Luke-Acts, we conclude that ‘Herod’ was intentionally setting himself up as some sort of quasi-divine or supernatural being.⁹⁹ In light of Luke 23:11, ‘Herod’s’ clothing himself in this manner at Acts 12:21 adds another layer to his mockery of Jesus – the king clothed Jesus with robes

⁹⁵ See BDAG, 461 and e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, 5.11; Plutarch, *Them.* 16.1; Plutarch, *Dem.* 22.1.

⁹⁶ So Bruce, *Acts*, 288; Haenchen, *Acts*, 386.

⁹⁷ Two aorist participles, ἐνδυσάμενος and καθίσας, indicate action that is antecedent to that of the imperfect main verb, ἐδημηγόρει.

⁹⁸ Josephus’ account (*Ant.* 19.344) indicates that Herod clothed himself with ‘a garment made entirely out of silver’ (στολήν ἐνδύς ἐξ ἀργύρου πεποιημένην πᾶσαν). Josephus may be illuminating from a historical standpoint, but it is not necessary to go beyond Luke-Acts to discover that Herod’s clothing would naturally prompt the reaction of the crowd described in Acts 12:22 and, as such, was entirely inappropriate.

⁹⁹ Note the reflexive middle ἐνδυσάμενος, ‘he clothed himself’ (Acts 12:21). Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, 179. As Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. Mary Ling (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1956), 19 states, ‘...he who makes himself as God calls forth the judgment of God.’

he viewed as suitable for himself when, in reality, they were perfectly suited to Jesus, further highlighting the rivalry between this king ‘Herod’ and the true king, Jesus (cf. Luke 1:5, 32-33).¹⁰⁰

The second action antecedent to ‘Herod’s’ address to the delegation, sitting on the βῆμα, is also ironic. In Acts, the βῆμα is the place from where governing officials issue judgments.¹⁰¹ However, in this instance, while ‘Herod’ is issuing his judgment he is judged by God ἀνθ’ ὧν οὐκ ἔδωκεν τὴν δόξαν τῷ θεῷ (Acts 12:23). When ‘Herod’ fails to deflect the adoration of the crowds,¹⁰² committing ‘the most fundamental of sins’,¹⁰³ the angel of the Lord strikes him (πατάσσω)¹⁰⁴ and he dies (ἐκψύχω) being consumed by worms (σκωληκόβρωτος).¹⁰⁵ Ἐκψύχω makes God’s judgment of ‘Herod’ explicit as this term only appears elsewhere in the story of the instantaneous deaths of Ananias and Sapphira who were condemned because they

¹⁰⁰ Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 152 notes that Caesar is a rival Lord/King to Jesus because of his idolatrous self-exaltation. Here, we could say the same about ‘Herod.’

¹⁰¹ ‘Herod’ (12:21), Gallio (18:12, 16-17), Festus (25:6, 17), and Caesar (25:10).

¹⁰² Contrast this to the deflection of worship by Peter (Acts 10:25-26) and Paul and Barnabas (Acts 14:11-18).

¹⁰³ Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 591.

¹⁰⁴ This is a sign of divine retribution, in contrast to 12:7. See Johnson, *Acts*, 215; Also see Allen, Jr., *Death of Herod*, 130.

¹⁰⁵ Σκωληκόβρωτος is *hapax* in the NT, but the notion of being consumed by worms as divine punishment is somewhat common in the LXX (cf. Job 2:9c; 25:6; Isa 14:11; Jud 16:17; 1 Macc 2:62; 2 Macc 9:9; Sir 7:17; 18:30—19:3). Allen, Jr., *Death of Herod*, 14–20 also notes several parallels in classical literature (Plut. *Sulla*; Appianus, *Bell. Civ.* LI; Pausanias, *Boetica*; Jos. *Ant.* 12.13) and m.*Sotah* 35.1 (see also LSJ, 1618; BDAG, 933). Nikos Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty*, JSPSS 30 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 303, n. 142 states, ‘The punishing scenario of “eaten by worms” in Acts 12:23...only serves to place Agrippa in the worse possible company...’ and goes on to cite the examples of Herod the Great and Antiochus Epiphanes IV enduring similar fates. I would add the case of Apion as well (Jos. *Apion* 2.143). Also Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom, ‘Paul, Agrippa I, and Antiochus IV: Two Persecutors in Light of 2 Maccabees 9,’ in *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, ed. David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 109–110. Thomas Africa, ‘Worms and the Death of Kings: A Cautionary Note on Disease and History,’ *Classical Antiquity* 1 (1982): 4–5 describes this sort of scene as a moralising tendency among ancient historians, used to demonstrate that divine wrath comes only on the worst offenders.

lied to God and tested the Holy Spirit (Acts 5:5, 10).¹⁰⁶ The irony is rich here. While ‘Herod’ speaks from the place of judgment regarding the peace he has apparently brokered with Tyre and Sidon, he is judged by the crowds to be a god. Immediately (παραχρῆμα), God issues his own judgment: a terrible, violent death for ‘Herod’ because of the king’s self-deification¹⁰⁷ and his persecution of the church.¹⁰⁸ I would add, in light of our investigation of ‘Herod’ as a composite, that this death is also punishment for the ruler’s execution of both John the Baptist and Jesus.

‘Herod’s’ life ends abruptly in Luke-Acts. The ruler who failed to listen to John the Baptist, imprisoned and beheaded the prophet (Luke 3:18-20; 9:9), has now met his own speedy end. The political opponent who did not listen to the message of Jesus as members of his own household did (Luke 8:3; Acts 13:1), has heard from God’s messenger, the angel of the Lord. The king/ruler who sought to kill Jesus (Luke 13:31) and ultimately participated in the execution of the innocent King of the Jews (Luke 23:6-12), is now a dead king. Though ‘Herod’ acted within the plan of God (Acts 4:25-27), when he tried to make himself a god (Acts 12:23), he was struck down.

The death of the representative political opponent of the Jesus movement is a narrative indication that political persecution will not hinder the spread of the gospel.¹⁰⁹ Talbert’s assessment is fitting, ‘Such stories of liberation were told to say

¹⁰⁶ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 323–324; Barrett, *Acts I–XIV*, 591.

¹⁰⁷ As Johnson, *Acts*, 218 points out, the death of Herod is likely a fulfilment of Luke 1:52.

¹⁰⁸ Allen, Jr., *Death of Herod*, 91; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 2: 157; Pervo, *Acts*, 312; Walter E. Pilgrim, *Uneasy Neighbors: Church and State in the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 141. Schwartz, *Agrippa I*, 146 disagrees.

¹⁰⁹ Yamazaki-Ransom, *Roman Empire*, 184. Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 56 notes that the political tone of Acts changes later in the narrative (chapters 14–28).

that there is nothing, certainly not a hostile ruler, that can prevent the deity and his followers from conquering the world.’¹¹⁰ Or in the words of Walton, ‘...the purposes of God cannot be frustrated by the interference of the empire and its servants.’¹¹¹

When God intervenes to remove an obstacle to the expansion of the message of the Kingdom of God, Luke makes note of it.¹¹² In Acts, persecution abets the spread of the word of God (cf. 8:1-4).¹¹³ Therefore, Acts 12:24 records, ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἤρξανεν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο. The words αὐξάνω and πληθύνω note the expansion of the Kingdom of God (Luke 13:19), the word of God/the Lord (Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20), and the numerical growth of the church (Acts 6:1, 7; 9:31).¹¹⁴ This conclusion to the narrative of ‘Herod’s’ punishment accords with the ending of Acts and its narration of Paul the political prisoner preaching and teaching ἀκωλύτως,¹¹⁵ indicating that incarceration of the one preaching is no hindrance to the spread of the message (Acts 28:31).¹¹⁶

‘Herod’ appears one final time at Acts 23:35 when Paul is detained in Caesarea at ‘Herod’s’ Praetorium. This setting serves to recall the death of ‘Herod’

¹¹⁰ Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 110. Though Talbert’s comments pertain specifically to Acts 12:1-19, his conclusion certainly applies to the whole Herod story in Acts 12. See also Spencer, *Journeying*, 139; Maddox, *Purpose*, 82.

¹¹¹ Walton, ‘Trying Paul?’, 139.

¹¹² Thompson, *One Lord, One People*, 141.

¹¹³ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 2: 157; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 397.

¹¹⁴ Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, 212; Kodell, ‘Word of God,’ 509–511; Johnson, *Acts*, 216.

¹¹⁵ Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*, 213. On ἀκωλύτως, see Johnson, *Acts*, 473; Pervo, *Acts*, 687. Richard J. Cassidy, ‘Paul’s Proclamation of Lord Jesus as a Chained Prisoner in Rome: Luke’s Ending Is in His Beginning,’ in *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, ed. David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 149 misses Luke’s intentional juxtaposition of Paul’s imprisonment and his preaching ἀκωλύτως by reading the adverb as ‘unintimidated.’

¹¹⁶ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 797. Rudolph Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte (Apg 13-28)*, EKK 5.2 (Köln: Neukirchener, 1986), 307 highlights the programmatic nature of Acts 28:30-31 for the entire narrative.

and with it, a reminder that political opposition toward those witnesses who proclaim the good news will not hinder the spread of the message of the Kingdom of God. To illustrate and reinforce this point, the final key protagonist, Paul, appears before kings and rulers who reject his message but inadvertently abet his progress toward Rome where he will preach without hindrance. Given the similarity in the depiction of King Agrippa and ‘Herod’, the narrative of Paul’s testimony before Agrippa recalls the interactions of both Jesus and Peter with ‘Herod’ (Luke 23:6-12; Acts 4:25-27; 12:1-5).

An examination of King Agrippa as a character is necessary not because the Agrippa behind the narrative is Agrippa II, son of Agrippa I (the ‘Herod’ of Acts 12) and the final Herodian King named in Luke-Acts. Nor is this necessary because this ruler (a member of the Herodian dynasty) is another historical individual that is part of the amalgamation I have called composite ‘Herod’. That obviously cannot be so; ‘Herod’ died in Acts 12:20-23! Rather, there are several other narrative reasons for examining this character. I have mentioned the primary reason to discuss Agrippa, namely the setting of Paul’s hearing at ‘Herod’s’ Praetorium. However, this alone is not enough to justify a description of Luke’s depiction of Agrippa as Paul appears before other Jewish and Roman rulers in the final chapters of Acts. So, why Agrippa? First is the narrative alignment of Agrippa with ‘Herod’ via the similarities with which each character is portrayed. There are parallels between Paul’s appearance before the King and Jesus’ appearance before ‘Herod’ (Luke 23:6-12): both ‘Herod’ and Agrippa are involved in their respective hearings after being prompted to do so by a Roman governor, both respond negatively to the respective defendants, both declare the defendants innocent of the crimes with which they have

been charged, and both remand the defendants to the custody of another despite their recognition of the innocence of the accused. Also, though to a lesser extent, there are parallels between Paul's trial before Agrippa and Peter's arrest and near execution at the hands of 'Herod'. Further to this point regarding the narrative alignment of Agrippa with 'Herod', Agrippa is a 'King', which recalls the stand taken by kings and rulers against the Lord and his Messiah (Acts 4:25-27) and, by extension, the Church. The depiction of Agrippa as 'King' also paints Agrippa as another wrongful claimant to the title that rightly belongs to Jesus (Luke 1:32-33; cf. Luke 1:5; Acts 17:7). Second, Paul's testimony before Agrippa is the final and climactic defense speech given by the apostle in Acts. Combining this climax with the setting at 'Herod's' Praetorium, the negative portrayal of Agrippa vis-à-vis Paul in ways that recall 'Herod's' opposition toward Jesus and Peter, and the outcome of the trial which sees Paul *en route* to Rome to preach at the 'end of the earth' (cf. Acts 1:8) draws together and illustrates the point made with regard to the narrative of 'Herod's' death: that diabolic opposition to the spread of the gospel, which is evidenced in political opposition towards Luke's protagonists, cannot hinder the spread of the gospel to the end of the earth. In other words, though Agrippa is characterized in many of the same negative ways as 'Herod', the point has already been made narratively via the story of 'Herod's' death that such political (satanic) opposition cannot hinder the spread of the gospel. The point is made explicit as Paul continues his journey toward Rome in order to witness there as the Lord had promised (Acts 23:11). Following a brief discussion of the narrative context of Acts 25-26, I will explicate the depiction of King Agrippa along these lines.

Context of Acts 25:13—26:32

As noted above, Paul becomes the key protagonist in the latter part of Acts beginning with his and Barnabas' commission from the church at Antioch (Acts 13:1-3).¹¹⁷ The focus on Paul in the later chapters of Acts takes place in two phases. The first phase covers Paul's travels to Asia Minor and Greece (Acts 13:4—21:36) and the second covers Paul's imprisonment and travel to Rome (Acts 21:37—28:31).¹¹⁸ In the first of these phases, Paul meets with a mixture of missionary successes on the one hand (cf. Acts 13:12; 15:41; 16:5, 11-15) and opposition and rejection on the other (Acts 14:5, 19; 16:22-24; 20:3).¹¹⁹ Eventually, Paul returns to Jerusalem, where he is arrested and falsely accused of defiling the Temple (Acts 21:27-36). This arrest serves as the transition to the second phase of Paul's ministry which is characterised by continual imprisonment in Jerusalem, Caesarea, and Rome.

Whereas Acts 13:4—21:36 alternates between Paul's travel and mission work, the second phase of Paul's story in Acts alternates between defence speeches and travel.¹²⁰ By the time Agrippa hears Paul's ἀπολογία, Paul has already testified in Jerusalem before a crowd (Acts 21:37—22:29) and before the Sanhedrin (Acts 22:30—23:10). Following the testimony before the Sanhedrin, Paul was transported under guard by troops of the Tribune, Claudius Lysias, who had been informed of a

¹¹⁷ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 494.

¹¹⁸ Spencer, *Journeying*, 140–146, 212–216. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 710 also sees a major division in the narrative at Paul's imprisonment in Jerusalem, though he has several smaller divisions in the first phase of Paul's ministry (Acts 9:1--14:28; 15:1-35; and 15:36--22:21).

¹¹⁹ Cf. also the contrasts at Acts 13:48-50; 17:11, 32.

¹²⁰ Spencer, *Journeying*, 213; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 531.

plot concocted by the Jews to kill Paul (Acts 23:11-35). Paul benefited from safe passage to Caesarea and there testified before Felix (Acts 24:1-27) and Festus (Acts 25:1-12). The latter governor brought Paul before King Agrippa in order to seek the King's Jewish perspective concerning what exactly he should report to the Emperor regarding Paul (Acts 25:13—26:32). After his defence before Agrippa, in which he is once again declared innocent of wrongdoing, Paul is transported to Rome (Acts 27:1—28:31). In Paul's arrival in Rome, we see the final stages of the entire narrative project taking shape as Paul eventually witnesses in Rome, the end of the earth (cf. Acts 1:8).¹²¹

Spencer notes several recurring themes in Paul's defence speeches, notably the repeated emphasis on Paul's innocence as determined by assorted Roman officials: Claudius Lysias (Acts 23:29), Festus (Acts 25:25), and King Agrippa (Acts 26:30).¹²² Other themes include the resurrection of the dead (Acts 23:6; 24:15, 20-21; 25:19; 26:6-8, 23), Paul's vision of the resurrected and exalted Jesus (Acts 22:3-21; 26:2-29), Paul's citizenship (Acts 21:39; 22:3; 26:4), and his Jewish heritage (Acts 22:3; 23:6-10; 24:14; 26:5).¹²³

Paul's hearing before Agrippa is the final stage of his trial in the Book of Acts. The bulk of Paul's defence before Agrippa is a recounting of Jesus' appearance to him on the Damascus road and his ensuing participation in the Christian mission (Acts 26:2-23). Historically, the Agrippa of Acts is Agrippa II, son of Agrippa I who

¹²¹ Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 533 states that the literary function of the trial narratives is to move Paul to Rome.

¹²² Spencer, *Journeying*, 213–214.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 214; Johnson, *Acts*, 442.

is the historic personage behind the narrative of Acts 12. According to the methodology adopted in this thesis, there is no indication of a family relationship between ‘Herod’ and Agrippa in the narrative proper so there is no reason to presume one in our analysis. We agree in this with Tannehill, who notes that the change of name obscures the relationship between Agrippa and the other Herods.¹²⁴

As for Agrippa as a Lukan character, we will see that he is portrayed as a King, thus recalling Acts 4:25-27, a passage that places opposition toward the Church in continuity with opposition faced by Jesus and specifically mentions the kings of the earth taking their stand as enemies of the Lord, the Messiah, and by extension the people of God. The depiction of Agrippa as King also recalls the prophecy of Jesus to his disciples that they would appear before kings and governors that we have discussed above (Luke 21:12).¹²⁵ Agrippa’s characteristics are eerily reminiscent of composite ‘Herod’, but the key difference in this case is that the political opposition faced by Paul in the latter chapters of Acts takes on a decidedly different tone than that embodied by ‘Herod’ earlier in the narrative.¹²⁶ ‘Herod’ killed John, is blamed for Jesus’ death, killed James, intended to kill Peter, and persecuted the church. Though the narrative hints at Paul’s eventual death,¹²⁷ it is not narrated and there is no corresponding threat toward Paul to that effect from the

¹²⁴ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 2: 316. Gaventa, *Acts*, 183 adds that the name ‘Agrippa’ stands in contrast to the name ‘Herod’ found earlier in the narrative.

¹²⁵ Robert F. O’Toole, *The Unity of Luke’s Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts*, Good News Studies 9 (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1984), 68; I. Howard Marshall, *Acts*, TNTC (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1980), 389; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 712.

¹²⁶ Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 56. The change in antagonists from ‘Herod’ to ‘Agrippa’ noted by Gaventa, *Acts*, 183 contributes to this change in tone.

¹²⁷ Scholars generally agree that several texts in Acts, especially 20:25-26, 38, indicate that the author knew of Paul’s eventual death. See Bovon, *Luke 1*, 8; Bruce, *Acts*, 13–14; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 85; Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 89; Frank E. Dicken, ‘Author and Date of Luke-Acts,’ in *Issues in Luke-Acts*, ed. Michael Pahl and Sean Adams (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012), 18–19.

Roman authorities in the final chapters of the book, including King Agrippa.¹²⁸

Rather, Agrippa, along with Festus and Berenice, conclude that Paul has done nothing wrong and that he could have been set free had he not appealed his case to Caesar. Paul will travel to Rome, ostensibly because of his appeal, but ultimately because it is God's will that he do so (Acts 23:11).¹²⁹ Political opposition, even in the relatively mild form of Paul's wrongful imprisonment, will not hinder the spread of the gospel to the end of the earth.

Paul before Agrippa

As we examine the characterisation of Agrippa, its similarity to and difference from the portrayal of 'Herod', and the parallels between Paul's interaction with the King and the interaction of earlier protagonists with 'Herod', we first remember that the place of Paul's imprisonment and trials is 'Herod's' Praetorium in Caesarea (Acts 23:35).¹³⁰ This location immediately recalls the story of 'Herod's'

¹²⁸ Moessner, 'Christ Must Suffer,' 254; Witherington III, *Acts*, 618–620.

¹²⁹ Johnson, *Acts*, 443; Gaventa, *Acts*, 317, 338.

¹³⁰ Brian Rapske, *Paul in Roman Custody*, vol. 3, *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 156–157, 170 believes that Herod's palace had been transformed into the governor's residence and Paul was detained in a single room there. Skinner, *Locating Paul*, 132–133, 145 rightly points out that the term ἀκροατήριον (Acts 25:23) indicates that Paul has not been moved from the Praetorium by the time of his appearance before Agrippa. In Josephus' account of Herod the Great's construction of Caesarea (*Ant.* 15.331–341), he notes the building of a palace (βασιλείος). Barbara Burrell, 'Palace to Praetorium: The Romanization of Caesarea,' in *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millennia*, ed. Avner Raban and Kenneth G. Holum (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 228–229, 240–247 discusses the transformation of Herod's palace at Caesarea into the Roman Praetorium, noting that it provided spaces similar to other residences of Roman governors for conducting official business (e.g., large open spaces for judicial hearings, dining/reception areas, luxurious private rooms, etc.). She concludes that it was the location of Festus' βῆμα and ἀκροατήριον. See also Joseph Patrich, *Studies in the Archaeology and History of Caesarea Maritima: Caput Judaeae, Metropolis Palaestinae* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 205–218. Heike Omerzu, *Der Prozess des Paulus: eine exegetische und rechtshistorische Untersuchung der Apostelgeschichte*, BZNTW 115 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002), 417 correctly indicates that naming this Herod's praetorium is technically incorrect as a praetorium required the presence of Praetor/Roman military governor.

death in Caesarea (Acts 12:20-23).¹³¹ The setting is ominous, especially with Paul imprisoned, hearkening back to ‘Herod’s’ antagonism evidenced by the ruler’s imprisonment of John the Baptist and Peter.¹³² However, the setting is also promising, recalling the death of ‘Herod’ and his inability to hinder the spread of the gospel by persecuting the church. Paul’s appearance before Agrippa substantiates both of these aspects: the apostle is imprisoned and remains so throughout the remainder of the narrative, but he is being propelled toward Rome (however slowly) by the promise of God that he will testify in the Imperial city (Acts 23:11).

When examining Acts 4, we saw that the ministries and lives of the early Christians are a narrative extension and continuation of Jesus’ own ministry (cf. Acts 1:1).¹³³ Accordingly, Paul’s various trials, especially his testimony before Agrippa and Festus, recall Jesus’ trials before Pilate and ‘Herod’.¹³⁴ This demonstrates again the centrality of Acts 4:24-31 to our understanding of political opposition in Luke-Acts as the experiences of Jesus, Peter, and Paul before ‘kings and rulers’ similarly.¹³⁵ In fact, the title ‘King’ appears for Agrippa more often than any other character in Luke-Acts, thereby showing that the scene at Acts 25:13—26:32 is

¹³¹ Skinner, *Locating Paul*, 51–53 states that the repetition of place names creates an archetypal setting that enhances the plot by anticipating and intensifying new aspects of that plot.

¹³² Ibid., 88–89 notes the connection between imprisonment and execution in the cases of John the Baptist, Jesus, and Peter.

¹³³ A. J. Mattill, Jr., ‘The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H. H. Evans Reconsidered,’ *NovT* 17 (1975): 37 states that Luke makes the life of Jesus evident in the Book of Acts.

¹³⁴ We agree with Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 208 who states that the echoes of Jesus’ trial before Herod and Pilate are ‘intentional and meaningful’. See also Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 87; Omerzu, *Der Prozess des Paulus*, 497; O’Toole, *Unity of Luke’s Theology*, 68–69; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 748; Johnson, *Acts*, 428; Haenchen, *Acts*, 673.

¹³⁵ Mattill, Jr., ‘Jesus-Paul Parallels,’ 37–40.

another example of kings and rulers taking their stand against the Lord and his anointed.¹³⁶

The recollections of Jesus' trial before 'Herod' in this passage help us understand the characterisation of Agrippa.¹³⁷ Broadly speaking, both Jesus and Paul stand trial after having been accused by the Jews of teaching that agitates the Jewish populace (Luke 23:2; Acts 25:2; cf. 21:28; 24:5, 9).¹³⁸ The trials of each are conducted by the Jewish religious leaders (Acts 22:30—23:9; Luke 22:66-71), a Roman governor or governors (Pilate [Luke 23:1-5, 13-25], Felix [Acts 24:1-23], and Festus [Acts 25:1—26:32]), and a king ('Herod' [Luke 23:6-12] and Agrippa [Acts 25:23—26:32]). Both Jesus and Paul are declared to be innocent three times and the language of King Agrippa's verdict in Paul's case (Acts 26:31-32) echoes that of Pilate in Luke 23:1-25 (a verdict with which 'Herod' agreed).¹³⁹ These parallels indicate that Agrippa is depicted vis-à-vis Paul much the same as 'Herod' vis-à-vis

¹³⁶ Agrippa is called 'King' eleven times in this story, three times by the narrator (Acts 25:13, 14; 26:30), twice by Festus (Acts 25:24, 26), and six times by Paul (Acts 26:2, 7, 13, 19, 26, 27).

¹³⁷ O'Toole, *Christological Climax*, 22–23 lists twelve similarities between Acts 26 and Luke 23:6-12.

¹³⁸ Witherington III, *Acts*, 731. There is no need to make a sharp distinction between the religious and political dimensions of Paul's trial. Robert C. Tannehill, 'The Narrator's Strategy in the Scenes of Paul's Defense,' *Forum* 8 (1992): 256, 259 offers a helpful perspective, noting that the political charges are secondary to the religious accusations, but both are present. This accounts for Paul's own statement concerning the reason for his trial, the resurrection from the dead (Acts 23:6; cf. 26:4-8), as well as the multiple hearings before political rulers. Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 584–586; Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 206 both emphasize the religious apologetic in Acts 25-26. Paul was on trial because of intra-Jewish disputes (Acts 26:4-8), but he was on trial before Roman authorities. Marshall, *Acts*, 386 makes a mistake when he excludes the religious aspects of the trial, claiming that the story shows the 'uprightness' of Roman justice as opposed to the injustice of the Jews.

¹³⁹ Johnson, *Acts*, 443; Bruce, *Acts*, 506–507; Bock, *Acts*, 724. The parallel terms are ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος (Luke 23:4), οὐδεὶς, θάνατος, ἄξιός, πρᾶσσω (Luke 23:15, 22), ἀπολύω (Luke 23:16, 20, 22). Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 61, 212, n. 49 shows that ἄξιός θάνατος is specifically Roman legal terminology (cf. Acts 23:29; 25:11; 25:25; 26:31).

Jesus: he is a king who has taken his stand in opposition to one of Luke's protagonists.¹⁴⁰

The nature of Agrippa's antagonism is both similar to and different from 'Herod's'. As with 'Herod', Agrippa's opposition stems from his failure to respond rightly to hearing and seeing the gospel proclaimed by Paul.¹⁴¹ The narrative of Agrippa's interaction with the apostle begins with his wish to hear Paul (Acts 25:22), to which we may compare 'Herod's' desire to see and hear from Jesus (Luke 9:9; 23:8).¹⁴² Agrippa permits Paul to speak just as 'Herod' questioned Jesus expecting a response (Acts 26:1; Luke 23:9; the difference being that Jesus remained silent before 'Herod', signifying the ruler's inability to hear, whereas Paul goes on to give a lengthy response to Agrippa).¹⁴³ Agrippa, after listening to Paul, proves that he did not hear the apostle by responding in mockery, just as 'Herod' did when Jesus refused to respond (Acts 26:24-28; Luke 23:11). Agrippa's mockery is most evident in his flippant dismissal of Paul (Acts 26:28).¹⁴⁴ Festus also mocks, accusing Paul of

¹⁴⁰ Spencer, *Journeying*, 234–235; O'Toole, *Christological Climax*, 25. Heike Omerzu, 'Das Traditionsgeschichtliche Verhältnis der Begegnungen von Jesus mit Herodes Antipas und Paulus mit Agrippa II,' *SNTSU* 28 (2003): 144–145 allows for some comparable elements between Jesus' Herodian trial and Paul's testimony before Agrippa, but emphasises the differences between the two scenes (e.g., Paul's lengthy speech stands in contrast to Jesus' silence, Antipas expresses Jesus' innocence symbolically whereas Agrippa states Paul's innocence plainly, Agrippa speaks but Antipas does not). His point is taken as there are clear differences between the scenes. My point, however, is that Agrippa and 'Herod' are portrayed similarly.

¹⁴¹ See above in the previous chapter on 'Herod' and Jesus.

¹⁴² John J. Kilgallen, 'Paul before Agrippa (Acts 26,2-23): Some Considerations,' *Bib* 69 (1988): 171; Bruce, *Acts*, 493; Witherington III, *Acts*, 731; Marshall, *Acts*, 389.

¹⁴³ Omerzu, 'Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,' 144.

¹⁴⁴ Here I agree with Pat Edwin Harrell, "'Almost Persuaded" Now to Believe - Acts 26:28,' *RestQ* 4 (1960): 254, who states that a sincere response from Agrippa is out of concord with the context. See also Spencer, *Journeying*, 239; Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 209; Johnson, *Acts*, 443. Abraham Malherbe, "'Not in a Corner": Early Christian Apologetic in Acts 26:26,' *SecCent* 5 (86 1985): 208–209 argues that Luke presents Paul in the philosophical tradition, a context in which an instantaneous conversion (such as that sought by Paul for Agrippa) would have been viewed with ridicule. His interpretation is part of his larger argument that part of Luke's purpose in the Book of Acts is to respond to pagan criticisms of Christianity. His interpretation offers one potential reason for Agrippa's mockery of Paul

having lost his mind (μαίνομαι, μανία, Acts 26:24).¹⁴⁵ Paul counters Festus' accusation and calls on King Agrippa as his own witness, asking if the King believes the message of the prophets, presumably as Paul has just explained it with specific reference to the resurrection of Jesus.¹⁴⁶ Agrippa's reply demonstrates clearly that he has neither heard Paul rightly nor believed the message of the prophets (Acts 26:28).¹⁴⁷ Note Luke's creative use of πείθω here. Whereas Paul is persuaded that Agrippa knows the matters of which Paul speaks (Acts 26:26), Agrippa will not be persuaded to be a Christian (Acts 26:28).¹⁴⁸ The implication is clear: καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ

in this case, but given our methodological constraints must remain in the background of our discussion. Bock, *Acts*, 723 understands Agrippa's response not as sarcastic, but 'somewhere between earnestness and irony'. However, this goes against his understanding of the term 'Christian' as acerbic. O'Toole, *Christological Climax*, 141–142 believes that Agrippa's response is sincere as the King is well-versed in all things Jewish. As further evidence for his reading of the text, he states that Paul's response assumes that Agrippa's response is sincere. O'Toole goes on to note that the King does not convert though he has seen and heard rightly. It is precisely the King's failure to convert that demonstrates that he has not seen and heard Paul's message and I contend requires us to understand Agrippa's response as sarcastic. Likewise, I disagree with Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 596, who interprets Agrippa's response to Paul as expressing a degree of consent. Marshall, *Acts*, 399–400 also does not detect irony in Agrippa's response to Paul, choosing to understand it as a light-hearted attempt to escape the rhetorical trap that Paul had set. The approach of J. E. Harry, 'Agrippa's Response to Paul (Acts 26.28),' *The Classical Review* 22 (1908): 240 is more measured as he does not believe that Agrippa's response is necessarily ironic. On the derogatory term Χριστιανός, Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 154–155 argues that 'Christian' is a term that shows that the church had become an identifiable, problematic group within society (cf. Acts 11:26). See also Harry W. Tajra, *The Trial of St. Paul*, WUNT II 35 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1989), 169; Johnson, *Acts*, 205. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 477–478 disagrees, understanding Χριστιανός as a neutral term, merely distinguishing Christians from Jews. Similarly, Witherington III, *Acts*, 751 sees the term as not necessarily contemptuous, but also not a self-designation used by Christians.

¹⁴⁵ See below on the portrayal of Festus.

¹⁴⁶ In his defence, Paul states that he stands trial for bearing witness to the resurrection of Jesus. He refers to his life as a Pharisee and persecutor of the church, the risen Jesus' confrontation of him on the road to Damascus, and his commission to carry the message of the resurrection to the Gentiles. As Allison A. Trites, 'The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts,' *NovT* 16 (1974): 279; Marshall, *Acts*, 391–392 argue, the resurrection (the hope of Israel) is the focal point of Paul's speech (Acts 26:6–8). Similarly, Schubert, 'Final Cycle,' 11–12 states that the resurrection from the dead is the key theological problem that is addressed in the Pauline speeches of Acts.

¹⁴⁷ O'Toole, *Christological Climax*, 142.

¹⁴⁸ As Paul André Harlé, 'Un "Private-Joke" de Paul dans le Livre des Acts (26:28–29),' *NTS* 24 (1978): 528 notes, the term implies volition. I disagree with Harry, 'Agrippa's Response,' 240, who states that Paul's intent in this story is not to convert Agrippa. This is to ignore Paul's desire that all be like him except for the chains (Acts 26:29).

ἐν μεγάλῳ,¹⁴⁹ Agrippa, failing to respond in faith to Paul's message, will not be persuaded to become like Paul.¹⁵⁰

There is, however, a point of contrast between 'Herod's' handling of Jesus' case and Agrippa's handling of Paul's. 'Herod' colluded with Pilate in Jesus' trial, with both rulers failing to do justice by sending Jesus to his death (Luke 23:1-25; Acts 4:25-27). In contrast, Agrippa colludes with Festus in the decision *not* to execute Paul, but to do what is right by sending Paul to Rome in accord with the terms of Paul's appeal to Caesar (Acts 26:31—27:1). The Lord has already appeared to Paul in order to tell of the apostle's impending testimony in Rome (Acts 23:11). As the death of John the Baptist at the hands of 'Herod' cleared the way for Jesus' ministry in the third gospel, as the death of Jesus (along with the resurrection and ascension) in which Luke implicates 'Herod' initiates the witness in the name of Jesus to the end of the earth, and as persecution experienced by the church and the apostles from 'Herod' resulted in the continued growth of the word of God, so this final act of King Agrippa illustrates the main point of this chapter, namely that political opposition (Agrippa's rejection of Paul's message) will not hinder the spread of the gospel. Apart from Agrippa's sending Paul to Rome, the character King Agrippa is portrayed in ways that are remarkably comparable to 'Herod' in the passion narrative of the third gospel.

¹⁴⁹ The phrase καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ may pertain to length of time or number of words. See e.g., Pervo, *Acts*, 637, n. 114; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles XV-XXVIII*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2004), 1170. Harlé, 'Un "Private-Joke",' 529 understands the terms only temporally. In either case, the meaning does not change. Agrippa will not convert.

¹⁵⁰ I disagree on this point with Gaventa, *Acts*, 347 who believes that Agrippa's response is ambiguous. Frank Crouch, 'The Persuasive Moment: Rhetorical Resolutions in Paul's Defense Before Agrippa,' in *SBL Seminar Papers 1996* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 340 overreaches, claiming that Agrippa's (and Festus') acceptance or rejection of Paul's message is the point of the narrative.

Though the parallels are not as pronounced as those between the respective trials of Paul and Jesus, Paul's appearance before King Agrippa echoes Peter's ordeal with King 'Herod' at several points as well. Paul is arrested (συλλαμβάνω, ἀναιρέω, Acts 23:27) and detained in prison (φυλάσσω, Acts 23:35) just as Peter had been earlier (Acts 12:2-4). The desires (βούλομαι) of both 'Herod' and Agrippa are known (Acts 12:4; 25:22) and as 'Herod' intended to bring (προάγω) Peter before the people at the festival (Acts 12:6), so Paul is brought before Agrippa (Acts 25:26). A final comparable detail is Agrippa and Berenice's entrance to the proceedings μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας. Φαντασία is *hapax* in the NT, but probably pertains to one's imposing, ostentatious appearance.¹⁵¹ This recalls 'Herod's' appearance before the crowd in Caesarea in his kingly attire (Acts 12:21),¹⁵² which was the first step toward 'Herod's' death at the hand of the angel of the Lord.¹⁵³

In narrating Paul's defence before Agrippa in ways that recall both Jesus' and Peter's experiences at the hands of 'Herod', Agrippa is one who is like 'Herod' as he rejects Paul's message, mocks the apostle, and presents himself in a haughty

¹⁵¹ BDAG, 1049; Barrett, *Acts XV-XXVIII*, 1145. The word group is rare in the NT. The verb φαντάζω only occurs at Heb 12:21. The noun φάντασμα appears in the story of Jesus walking on the water (Mark 6:49, par. Matt 14:26) and in a variant in the D text of Luke 24:37, which describes a resurrection appearance of Jesus. In every case, the terms describe something that is seen that causes fear in the one seeing.

¹⁵² Pervo, *Acts*, 621, n. 2. Given the use of φαντασία with reference to the King here, the term likely connotes royalty, see e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 676; Johnson, *Acts*, 426; Witherington III, *Acts*, 731-732; Skinner, *Locating Paul*, 145. Perhaps this also recalls Jesus' contrast between John the Baptist and those who live in comfort in palaces (Luke 7:24-28). In that passage Jesus says that John is the greatest to ever live, but that the least in the Kingdom of God is greater than John. By implication then, those who live in luxury in palaces (those who appear to be greater than John, i.e., Agrippa and Berenice) are far removed from greatness in the Kingdom of God.

¹⁵³ Kokkinos, *Herodian Dynasty*, 98, n. 51 compares Agrippa II's pomp (Acts 25:23) with Agrippa I's appearance in Jos. *Ant.* 19.344.

manner.¹⁵⁴ The characters associated with Agrippa add to this portrayal of the king, just as the characters associated with ‘Herod’ reinforced the depiction of that ruler.

Two groups appear in this passage alongside King Agrippa, οἱ χιλιάρχοι and ἄνδρες τοῖς κατ’ ἐξοχὴν τῆς πόλεως (Acts 25:23). Neither of these two groups are characterised apart from their apparent agreement with Agrippa’s verdict that Paul had done nothing wrong and needed to be detained further only because of his appeal to Caesar (Acts 26:30-32). However, there are indications that point toward their positive depiction. This is the only occurrence of χιλιάρχος in the plural; the other sixteen times it appears in Acts it refers to Claudius Lysias (Acts 21:31, 32, 33, 37; 22:24, 26, 27, 28, 29; 23:10, 15, 17, 18, 19, 22; 24:22). Lysias was the tribune in charge of the soldiers who quieted the near-riot that occurred after the Jews accused Paul of defiling the Temple by arresting the apostle (Acts 21:27-36; 23:10). He held Paul in custody, preparing Paul for a beating, but fearing for his own welfare after learning that Paul was a Roman citizen (Acts 22:22-29). Upon learning of a plot by the Jews to kill Paul, Lysias coordinated Paul’s safe passage to Caesarea (Acts 23:12-22). Following Paul’s arrival in Caesarea, Felix expected Lysias to come there to provide information that would help the governor decide Paul’s case (Acts 24:22). In these ways, Lysias is a positive character as the Tribune keeps Paul safe from harm. Lysias provides the only other indication of the portrayal of οἱ χιλιάρχοι, and since they are not described further in the present pericope, we are left to conclude

¹⁵⁴ Pace Witherington III, *Acts*, 738, who states that Luke presents Agrippa in a ‘rather favorable light’. The parallels between Agrippa and ‘Herod’ preclude an entirely positive assessment of Agrippa. The differences between the portrayal of ‘Herod’ and Agrippa may be accounted for by the narrative shift that occurs with the death of ‘Herod’ which indicates that political opposition will not hinder the spread of the gospel. While this shift does not eliminate the negative depiction of political rulers such as Agrippa, it does result in their milder depiction which suits the tone of the later chapters of Acts in accordance with the narrative emphasis on the failure of political/satanic opposition to the spread of the good news to the end of the earth that ‘Herod’s’ death signifies.

that they are similarly disposed toward Paul as Lysias. Their agreement with Agrippa (Acts 26:30-32) bears this out. Also part of this group are the ἄνδρες τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν τῆς πόλεως with οἱ χιλιάρχοι with a τε...καί construction as he introduces these men into the story.¹⁵⁵ This close relationship results in a tacitly positive depiction of the prominent men. Like the tribunes, these prominent men do nothing other than agree with Agrippa's verdict (Acts 26:30-32). The combination of king and rulers (βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππα and οἱ χιλιάρχοι) recalls Acts 4:26 where the kings and rulers take their stand against the Lord and his Messiah. We must understand the appearance of a king and rulers in the present passage in light of that passage. In this way, we expect opposition toward Paul from these two entities. It is at this point, however, that we also recall the death of 'Herod' which signified narratively that such opposition from kings and rulers cannot stop the growth and multiplication of the word of God. So, instead of the expected hostility toward Paul, we instead see the King and rulers unwittingly contributing to the progress of the gospel by sending Paul to Rome (Acts 26:32; cf. 23:11).¹⁵⁶ In this way, the appearance of these two group characters alongside King Agrippa adds to the softening in tone that occurs in interactions between the protagonists and political rulers in the latter chapters of Acts.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ On this construction, see above on Acts 4:27 and F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. Robert W. Funk (London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 230 (§ 444); BDAG, 993.

¹⁵⁶ Gaventa, *Acts*, 338. Witherington III, *Acts*, 729–730 correctly notes that both Felix and Festus failed to do what was right by not dismissing the charges against Paul and setting him free. Similarly, Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 210 sees an indictment of Roman justice as Paul remains in chains despite his innocence. However, once Paul appealed to Caesar, Festus was bound to honour that appeal.

¹⁵⁷ Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 56.

In addition to these two groups, two individuals also appear with Agrippa: Berenice and Festus. We begin with Berenice.¹⁵⁸ Simply noted are Berenice's presence at three crucial junctures of the story¹⁵⁹ and her agreement with Agrippa's verdict (Acts 26:30-32). As a result, it is the depiction of Agrippa that informs how we should understand the depiction of Berenice. Her ostentatious entrance into the audience hall with Agrippa recalls 'Herod's' ostentatious display at Caesarea.¹⁶⁰ Her agreement with Agrippa highlights her correct appraisal of Paul and likely rejection of the apostle's message. She joins Agrippa in the execution of justice by sending Paul to Rome and thereby abetting the spread of the good news to the end of the earth. The bare characterisation of Berenice is dependent on the character with whom Luke most closely associates her, Agrippa.

As for Festus, the portrayal of the governor tips in favour of the negative.¹⁶¹ Before Agrippa appears in the narrative, Festus, upon taking up his post as governor,

¹⁵⁸ We may be tempted to follow Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Peabody: Hendricksen, 2003), 164 who states that Luke's reference to Berenice here is a sarcastic joke in light of Agrippa's supposed knowledge of Jewish matters (Acts 26:2-3) and his rumoured incest with his sister as reported by Josephus (*Ant.* 20.145-147) and Juvenal (*Sat.* VI.156-160). Haenchen, *Acts*, 679 states that any educated person would have known about Agrippa and Berenice's incestuous relationship. This is debatable, as Gaventa, *Acts*, 336 notes, but his point is taken. The rumours surrounding these siblings were probably widespread and relatively well-known especially given Berenice's affair with Titus Caesar. Harrell, 'Almost Persuaded,' 253 takes a similar approach, referring to Berenice as Agrippa's 'sister-wife'. Grace H. Macurdy, 'Julia Berenice,' *AJP* 56 (1935): 249 believes that it is unlikely that Agrippa and Berenice followed the eastern sister-wife custom because of their attempts to maintain an outwardly scrupulous Jewish life. These are interesting historical points, but our methodological constraints preclude any such interpretive moves since we have confined our analysis to the text of Luke-Acts itself.

¹⁵⁹ She enters the narrative with Agrippa, accompanying the King to Caesarea in order to welcome Festus (Acts 25:13), she enters the audience hall along with Agrippa in order to hear Paul, and she exits with Agrippa (Acts 25:23), Festus, and the other prominent individuals to deliberate the verdict of Paul's case (Acts 26:30).

¹⁶⁰ Pace Ross Kraemer, 'Ber(e)nice,' in *Women in Scripture*, ed. Carol Meyers (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 60-61, who notes that Berenice is a passive observer of whom Luke is uncritical. This is to dismiss the negative connotations her close association with Agrippa the character brings to her as a character.

¹⁶¹ Pervo, *Acts*, 616-617 discusses the difficulties surrounding the portrayal of Festus here. He states that Festus is not a hypocrite, but he is self-flattering. Pervo is correct that the main character is Paul, but we do not need to despair in an attempt to understand Festus as a character in his own right.

hears about Paul from the apostle's Jewish accusers (Acts 25:1-2). Festus wants to grant a favour to the Jewish leaders (Acts 25:3, 9), but is pre-empted by Paul's appeal to Caesar (Acts 25:10-12). The governor's near acquiescence to the desires of the Jewish leaders points to a portrayal in line with Paul's persistent opponents (cf. 'Herod's' desire to please the Jews at Acts 12:3). Additionally, Festus serves the wrong Lord, which contributes to the depiction of the governor as one who is potentially hostile. As Rowe has shown, Festus' regarding Caesar as Lord (in his comment that he has nothing definite to write τῷ κυρίῳ concerning Paul, Acts 25:26) stands in contrast to Jesus' lordship over all (Acts 10:36).¹⁶² Furthermore, Festus, like Agrippa, listens to Paul's testimony but fails to hear the message he proclaims as evidenced by his accusing Paul of being out of his mind (μαίνομαι, μανία, Acts 26:24).¹⁶³ Finally, like Agrippa, Festus sees no basis for the charges against Paul

Parsons, *Acts*, 333 rightly states that Acts 25:13-27 is Luke's development of the character Festus. Cassidy, *Society and Politics*, 111; Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 206; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 2: 314; Witherington III, *Acts*, 729 all understand Festus as self-serving (Acts 25:13-22). I disagree with Barrett, *Acts XV-XXVIII*, 1134 who sees Festus in contrast to and in a more favourable light than the Jews. Luke may portray Festus more favourably than he does the Jews, but Festus does not represent a contrast to them. In fact, Festus seeks to collaborate with the Jews (Acts 25:9). I disagree also with Schubert, 'Final Cycle,' 6, who argues that Festus is portrayed as competent and expedient. Festus is neither in the narrative of Acts. Finally, I disagree with Haenchen, *Acts*, 674-675 who states that Acts 25:13-22 rehabilitates Festus, portraying him as an ignorant non-Jew. Similar to Haenchen, Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 586, 596 notes that Festus is simply ignorant of the matters at hand.

¹⁶² Rowe, *World Upside Down*, 105-106.

¹⁶³ Omerzu, 'Das Traditionsgeschichtliche,' 141 states that Festus' response is brusque. Gaventa, *Acts*, 346 states that Festus' response is due to his balking at the idea of resurrection or his mockery of Paul because of his own inability to comprehend what Paul is saying. There is most likely an element of both included in Acts 26:24. O'Toole, *Christological Climax*, 125 states that the terms imply mental illness. See also Spencer, *Journeying*, 238; Witherington III, *Acts*, 748; Bock, *Acts*, 722; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 763-764; Marshall, *Acts*, 398-399. Supporting our understanding of the terms as derisive, O'Toole, *Christological Climax*, 129; Johnson, *Acts*, 439 note the use of μαίνομαι at Acts 12:15 where the gathered community accuses Mary of being out of her mind after seeing Peter, who had been miraculously freed from prison, at the door of her house. Crouch, 'Persuasive Moment,' 339 notes, it is Paul's second mention of the resurrection that causes Festus' interruption. O'Toole, *Christological Climax*, 128 writes that Festus' reaction is not surprising as Luke tells of others who mock Christians for proclaiming the resurrection (cf. Acts 4:2; 17:32). I disagree with Barrett, *Acts XV-XXVIII*, 1167 who understands μανία as a cognate of μάντις. This makes Festus' accusation not offensive, but rather an exclamation of Paul's inspired speech or status as a seer. Paul's statement in response to Festus, in which he claims that he speaks ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα (Acts 26:25) precludes a positive assessment of Festus' accusation.

(Acts 25:27) and agrees with Agrippa's verdict that though Paul is innocent, he must be sent to Rome (Acts 26:30-32).¹⁶⁴ So, though the depiction of Festus begs for some further expression of the governor's hostility toward Paul, Festus' recognition of Paul's innocence further underscores the point that even expected political opposition will not hinder Paul from moving on with his work of witnessing in Rome.¹⁶⁵

Thus, the characterisation of the groups and individuals who appear alongside Agrippa reinforces the portrayal of the King. Accordingly, Agrippa is a king of the earth who has taken his stand against Paul, rejecting Paul's call to believe in the prophets and mocking the apostle. In this way, Agrippa is similar to 'Herod' and this aspect of the portrayal of Agrippa points towards Paul's imminent demise at the hands of the King. However, unlike 'Herod', Agrippa's opposition finds no further expression.¹⁶⁶ Instead, Agrippa sends Paul to Rome and to Caesar, unwittingly contributing to the plan of God for Paul to bear witness in Rome (cf. Acts 23:11).¹⁶⁷ So, while this characterisation of Agrippa often recalls his characterisation of 'Herod', the difference in their respective portrayals highlights the Lukan theme explored in this chapter, i.e., that political opposition cannot hinder the proclamation of the good news to the end of the earth.

¹⁶⁴ This verdict aligns the two characters, as Cassidy, *Society and Politics*, 114–115 states.

¹⁶⁵ Pace Haenchen, *Acts*, 688 who states that Luke does not intend to give 'an individual portrait of Festus here', but rather only seeks to show that the Roman state is incapable of dealing with Jewish theological matters.

¹⁶⁶ Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, vol. 2: 316.

¹⁶⁷ Johnson, *Acts*, 179, 443; Pervo, *Acts*, 637.

Conclusion

Acts 12:23-24 is a fitting conclusion to story of 'Herod' in Luke-Acts. As I have demonstrated above, one of the primary themes of Luke-Acts is the proclamation and spread of the good news to the end of the earth. Any impediments to this proclamation in the Lukan narrative, including the antagonism of 'Herod', may be traced back to the desire of the devil/Satan to hinder the outward expansion of the gospel. In the narrative, the devil holds authority over the kingdoms of the inhabited world (i.e., the Roman Empire), delegating and granting that authority to whomever he wishes. The connection between the devil and 'Herod' is established as 'Herod' is both king and ruler with authority, thus providing an explanation for the source of 'Herod's' hostility toward those key figures who proclaim the gospel in Luke-Acts. 'Herod', as one who embodies the opposition of Satan to the spread of the gospel in the Lukan narrative, is finally struck down not only for his failure to deflect divine praise, but also his persecution of the protagonists. The conclusion to the story of 'Herod's' death is ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἡϋξανεὺν καὶ ἐπληθύνετο (Acts 12:24), which points toward the conclusion of his narrative in Rome with Paul preaching without hindrance.

Paul himself appears before one of the kings of the earth, Agrippa, whom Luke casts in terms that are reminiscent of 'Herod's' antagonism, but without the concomitant death (or intended death) of the protagonist that such characterisation expects. Paul's mission of turning people from the power of Satan to God (Acts 26:18) will continue as the risen Lord promised him it would (Acts 23:11).¹⁶⁸ The

¹⁶⁸ Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 197.

story of Paul at ‘Herod’s’ Praetorium in Caesarea ends with the onward advance of the gospel toward Rome as Agrippa *et al.* concur that Paul is innocent and decide to send him to Caesar. As Marshall states, ‘Thus Paul’s long-delayed desire to see Rome was brought a step nearer to fulfilment.’¹⁶⁹ In Rome, Paul remained...proclaiming the Kingdom of God and teaching the things concerning Jesus Christ with all boldness, unhindered (ἐμείνεν...κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως, Acts 28:31).

¹⁶⁹ Marshall, *Acts*, 401.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

Summary of the Thesis

I have argued that ‘Herod’ may be construed as a composite character in the narrative of Luke-Acts. As we saw above, scholars have long puzzled over the chronological problems of the Lukan birth narrative as well as the appearance of the name ‘Herod’ for Agrippa. These are, without doubt, historical anomalies. My argument is a unique literary solution that helps account for these distinctive features in Luke-Acts regarding the presentation of the Herodian rulers throughout his gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. To support my claim, we noted that Luke and Acts are not alone among ancient writings that feature composite characters that fill stereotyped roles and illustrate key themes in those writings.

In accordance with the exegesis of Acts 4:25-27 above, composite ‘Herod’ serves as a representative king and ruler embodying Satanic opposition toward the protagonists of his narrative. Outside Acts 4:25-27, ‘Herod’ is the only character in Luke-Acts who appears as a king *and* ruler and is depicted ‘Herod’ as staunchly antagonistic toward John the Baptist, Jesus, the apostles, and the church.¹ ‘Herod’, following his rejection of John the Baptist’s rebuke, becomes John’s judge, jury, and executioner. Subsequent to John’s execution, ‘Herod’ seeks to see Jesus, not to learn from him, but rather to kill him and/or see him perform a miracle. ‘Herod’ had already rejected the good news of the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus as

¹ This corresponds with the expectation that Hellenistic authors portray their characters consistently throughout a literary work.

evidenced by the presence of Jesus' followers in his own household. It is no surprise when 'Herod' colludes with Pontius Pilate to have Jesus executed. Later, after the church has begun to propagate successfully the teachings of Jesus, 'Herod' re-emerges to persecute the church, execute James, and imprisoning Peter.

To explain this portrayal of 'Herod', we saw that the Lukan narrative evidences a cosmic conflict between Satan and God, with Satan portrayed as working to hinder the proclamation of the gospel. In this way, the source of 'Herod's' antagonism lies with the source of his authority, the devil, who is portrayed as holding authority over the inhabited world and granting it to whomever he wishes. However, the entirety of Luke-Acts points to the proclamation of the gospel that was initiated by John the Baptist and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke continuing to the end of the earth through the preaching of the apostles and church in Acts. Therefore, antagonism, opposition, and persecution – whether it arises directly from the devil or 'Herod' (or others) – cannot hinder this goal as it is driven by God's will and the power of the Spirit. The narrative of 'Herod's' death, in which the King is struck dead by the angel of the Lord because he portrays himself as a quasi-divine or supernatural being, proves the unstoppable nature of the spread of the gospel as 'Herod's' death leads directly to the continued spread and multiplication of the word of God. Later, Paul testifies before a king and several rulers in Caesarea at the ominous locale, 'Herod's' Praetorium. The combination of kings and rulers in a setting reminiscent of 'Herod' all points to Paul's imminent death. However, Paul's proclamation, described as turning hearers from the power of Satan to God, will not stop short of Rome as the Lord had told the apostle in a vision. The proclamation of

the good news of the Kingdom of God initiated by John, carried out by Jesus, and continued in the witness of the apostles and church continues unhindered.

Implications

Several avenues for future research as a result of this study could be noted. The presence of a composite character may have implications for our understanding of the genre of Luke-Acts. The depiction of characters, and composites in particular, in written texts likely has a bearing on studies concerning orality and memory. Of the several implications of this thesis, I want to note two.

Literary Matters Matter

I have labelled the distinctive features of the presentation of the Herodian rulers in Luke-Acts anomalies, and they are *historical* anomalies. True enough, no Herodian ruler ever held the title ‘King of Judaea’, no Herod was King during Quirinius’ governorship over Syria, and the senior Agrippa did not use the name ‘Herod’. Is our only option to agree with Luke Johnson, ‘Luke simply has the facts wrong’?² It is my contention that we can only agree with Johnson if the conclusions of literary analyses do not matter. In chapter three above concerning the methodology adopted for the thesis, I referred to Ronald Sack’s observation regarding ‘Nebuchadnezzar’ as a composite character. The full citation reads as follows,

² Luke T. Johnson, *Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 49. This is his assessment of the problem of Quirinius’ census (Luke 2:1-2).

Close examination will demonstrate that the Hebrew writer did indeed have a correct knowledge of history in the Post-Exilic period; he did, however, represent a character as he thought he should be represented so as to fulfil the purposes of a didactic treatise. If the end result appeared to a historian or a literary critic as confusion, it was simply the product of a misunderstanding of what the author intended to do.³

Sack's point should be heeded. We may concede that occasionally an ancient author was confused about particular historical or biographical details; every author is at some point. However, the occasional recurrence of literary features such as composite characters should give us pause in dismissing the historical accuracy of these writings too quickly. In fact, the recurrence of such conventions may show that adaptation of historical and biographical information for greater ideological reasons may be an ancient literary convention. The present study has explored the narrative portrayal of 'Herod' in Luke-Acts vis-à-vis what is known of the Herods outside these writings – the necessary first step in determining the presence of a composite character.⁴ Such a study does not undermine the historical task. We could examine any of the examples of composites listed above in chapter three and determine who the historic individuals are behind them. A purported historical anomaly may indicate confusion or inaccuracy on the part of an author; it could also point to a purposeful adaptation in the service of the author's ideological outlook. This is an avenue for further research.

³ Ronald Sack, *Images of Nebuchadnezzar: The Emergence of a Legend*, 2nd rev. and exp. ed. (London: Associated University Presses, 2004), 104.

⁴ See chapters four through six above. Several other examples have been noted above in chapter three.

The Progressive Vilification of 'Herod'

As we have seen, composite 'Herod' in an overwhelmingly negative character in the Lukan writings. 'Herod' represents a redaction of the Markan depiction of King Herod (Antipas) in Mark 6:14-29. Luke-Acts also goes beyond the first evangelist's depiction of the Herods. Matthew's Herod the Great is a jealous king fearing a usurper (Matt 2:1-18), Archelaus is a source of terror for the holy family (Matt 2:22), and Herod the Tetrarch/King orders the execution of John the Baptist (Matt 14:1-12). 'Herod' is all of these things and more in Luke-Acts. Within the synoptic gospels and Acts we see the development of a trajectory that progressively vilifies the Herodian rulers and culminates in composite 'Herod' in the Lukan writings.⁵

Luke-Acts is not the end point of this trajectory and traditions about 'Herod' continued to develop, as we saw in our discussion of the *Gospel of Peter* above. In this second century apocryphal gospel, most of the responsibility for Jesus' death that Pilate bears in the canonical gospels is shifted to 'Herod'. This vilification continues, as the *Letter of Herod to Pilate* which we referred to in the introduction evidences. Though the Herodian rulers make relatively few appearances in Christian literature subsequent to the composition of the gospels, those few appearances would provide a manageable number of data points for a study that could yield interesting results in

⁵ This is not to make a claim concerning Luke's sources. Within the two-source hypothesis (Matthew and Luke each knew Q and Mark independently), the Farrar hypothesis (Matthew was dependent on Mark and Luke knew both of them), and even Augustine's hypothesis (the gospels were composed in the order in which they appear in the Christian canon), Luke is dependent in some way upon earlier gospels or gospel-like texts and therefore represents a development in the direction that I am suggesting in this conclusion. My point here is simply to note that the portrayal of the Herods as composite 'Herod' in Luke-Acts represents a point on the trajectory from the Gospel of Mark to other early Christian writings that portray 'Herod' or the Herods even more negatively.

the fields of reception and canon studies. In these ways (and in others), understanding 'Herod' as a composite character in Luke-Acts offers interesting possibilities that may lead to more conclusive solutions for problems and issues in Lukan scholarship in particular and the wider field of NT and early Christian studies, particularly with regard to reception history.

Bibliography

- Abrams, M. H. 'Character and Characterization.' *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, 42-44. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1988.
- . 'Stock Characters.' *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, 343-344. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1988.
- Africa, Thomas. 'Worms and the Death of Kings: A Cautionary Note on Disease and History.' *Classical Antiquity* 1 (1982): 1-17.
- Ahn, Yong-Sung. *The Reign of God and Rome in Luke's Passion Narrative: An East Asian Global Perspective*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Alexander, Loveday. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Allen, Jr., O. Wesley. *The Death of Herod: The Narrative and Theological Function of Retribution in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 158. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.
- Aristotle. *Aristotle, The Poetics; 'Longinus', On the Sublime; Demetrius, On Style*. Translated by W. Hamilton Fyfe. Loeb Classical Library 199. London: William Heinemann, 1928.
- Attridge, Harold W. 'Josephus and His Works.' In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Michael E. Stone, 185-232. Vol. 2. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.
- Aune, David. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: An Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. 3rd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Bar-Efrat, Shimon. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. Translated by Dorothea Shefer-Vanson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 70. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.
- Barnes, Timothy D. 'The Date of Herod's Death.' *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968): 204-209.

- Barrett, C. K. *The Acts of the Apostles I-XIV*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles XV-XXVIII*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.
- Baumgarten, Albert I. 'Rabbinic Literature as a Source for the History of Jewish Sectarianism in the Second Temple Period.' *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 14–57.
- Berlin, Adele. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*. Bible and Literature. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983.
- Betz, Otto. 'The Kerygma of Luke.' *Interpretation* 22 (1968): 131–146.
- Bickerman, E. J. 'The Chain of Pharisaic Tradition.' In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, edited by Amram Tropper, 528–542. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Bilde, Per. *Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works and Their Importance*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Blinzler, Josef. *The Trial of Jesus*. Translated by Isabel and Florence McHugh. Cork: The Mercier Press, 1959.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Acts*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.
- . *Luke 1:1-9:50*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- . *Luke 9:51-24:53*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- . *Proclamation From Prophecy and Pattern*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 12. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Bond, Helen K. *Caiaphas: Friend of Rome and Judge of Jesus*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2004.
- . 'Josephus on Herod's Domestic Intrigue in the Jewish War.' *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 43 (2012): 295–314.

- . ‘New Currents in Josephus Research.’ *Currents in Research Biblical Studies* 8 (2000): 162–190.
- . *Pontius Pilate in History and Interpretation*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Bouvier, Bertrand, François Bovon, and Frédéric Amsler, trans. ‘ACTES DE PHILIPPE.’ In *Écrits Apocryphes Chrétiens*, edited by François Bovon and Pierre Geoltrain, 1179–1320. Paris: Gallimard, 1997.
- Bovon, François. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 9,51-14,35)*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar 3.2. Zurich: Benziger, 1996.
- . *Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Lk 19,28-24,53)*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar 3.4. Düsseldorf: Neukirchener, 2009.
- . *Luke 1*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002.
- Brawley, Robert L. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Brock, Ann Graham. *Mary Magdalene, The First Apostle: The Struggle for Authority*. Harvard Theological Studies 51. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah*. 2nd ed. London: Chapman, 1993.
- . *The Death of the Messiah*. Vol. 1. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- . *The Death of the Messiah*. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Bruce, F. F. ‘Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea.’ *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 5 (1963): 6–23.
- . *The Acts of the Apostles*. Third Revised and Enlarged. Leicester: Apollos, 1990.
- Brueggemann, Walter. ‘Luke 3:1-4.’ *Interpretation* 30 (1976): 404–409.
- Bryan, Christopher. *Render to Caesar: Jesus, the Early Church, and the Roman Superpower*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Bunn, L. H. ‘Herod Antipas and “That Fox”.’ *Expository Times* 43 (1931): 380–381.
- Burkill, T. A. ‘The Condemnation of Jesus: A Critique of Sherwin-White’s Thesis.’ *Novum Testamentum* 12 (1970): 321–342.

- Burns, John Barclay. 'Pharaoh in the Old Testament: A Literary Degradation.' *Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* 7 (1987): 17–26.
- Burrell, Barbara. 'Palace to Praetorium: The Romanization of Caesarea.' In *Caesarea Maritima: A Retrospective after Two Millennia*, edited by Avner Raban and Kenneth G. Holum, 228–250. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Burridge, Richard A. 'The Genre of Acts - Revisited.' In *Reading Acts Today: Essays in Honour of Loveday C. A. Alexander*, edited by Steve Walton, Thomas E. Phillips, Lloyd K. Pietersen, and F. Scott Spencer, 3–28. Library of New Testament Studies 427. London: T & T Clark, 2011.
- . *What Are the Gospels?* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Buth, Randall. 'That Small-fry Herod Antipas, or When a Fox Is Not a Fox.' *Jerusalem Perspective Online* (January 1, 2004).
- Cadbury, Henry J. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*. Harvard Theological Studies VI. New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969.
- . 'The Tradition.' In *The Beginnings of Christianity*, edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson, Kirsopp Lake, and Henry J. Cadbury, V: 209–264. London: Macmillan and Co., 1933.
- Cadbury, Henry J., and Kirsopp Lake. 'The Acts of the Apostles.' In *The Beginnings of Christianity*, edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson, Kirsopp Lake, and Henry J. Cadbury. Vol. IV. London: Macmillan and Co., 1933.
- Carroll, John T. *Luke: A Commentary*. The New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012.
- Cassidy, Richard J. *Jesus, Politics, and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1978.
- . 'Paul's Proclamation of Lord Jesus as a Chained Prisoner in Rome: Luke's Ending Is in His Beginning.' In *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, edited by David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee, 142–154. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011.
- . *Society and Politics in The Acts of the Apostles*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1987.
- Chadwick, Henry. *Origen: Contra Celsum: Translated with an Introduction & Notes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

- Chariton. 'Chaereas and Callirhoe.' In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, translated and edited by B. P. Reardon, 17–124. London: University of California Press, 1989.
- Charles, R. H., ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament: In English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*. Vol. 1: Apocrypha. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. London: Cornell University, 1978.
- Clarke, Andrew D. *Parallel Lives: The Relation of Paul to the Apostles in the Lucan Perspective*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2001.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome*. Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Collins, Raymond. 'The Representative Figures of the Fourth Gospel.' In *These Things Have Been Written: Studies on the Fourth Gospel*, 1–45. Louvain Theological and Pastoral Monographs 2. Louvain: Peeters Press, 1990.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles*. 2nd ed. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- . *The Theology of St. Luke*. Trans. by Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.
- Cooper, Kate. *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Cope, Lamar. 'The Death of John the Baptist in The Gospel of Matthew; or The Case of the Confusing Conjunction.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1974): 515–519.
- Corley, Kathleen E. *Private Women, Public Meals*. Peabody: Hendricksen, 1993.
- . *Women and the Historical Jesus: Feminist Myths of Christian Origins*. Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2002.
- Cowper, B. Harris. *The Apocryphal Gospels and Other Documents Relating to the History of Christ*. 4th ed. London: Frederick Norgate, 1874.
- Crouch, Frank. 'The Persuasive Moment: Rhetorical Resolutions in Paul's Defense Before Agrippa.' In *SBL Seminar Papers 1996*, 333–342. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

- . ‘Luke.’ In *Luke - John*, 1-490, edited by Leander E. Keck, *et al.* New Interpreter’s Bible IX. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- Cunningham, Scott. *Through Many Tribulations: The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 142. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms I: 1-50*. Anchor Bible 16. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Danker, Frederick William, ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Darr, John A. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 163. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- . *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.
- Davies, Anna Morpurgo. ‘Greek Personal Names and Linguistic Continuity.’ In *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*, edited by Elaine Matthews and Simon Hornblower, 15–39. Proceedings of the British Academy 104. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Dawsey, James M. ‘What’s in a Name? Characterization in Luke.’ *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 16 (1986): 143–147.
- Deissmann, G. Adolf. *Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity*. Translated by Alexander Grieve. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1903.
- Delehay, Hippolyte. *The Legends of the Saints: An Introduction to Hagiography*. Translated by V. M. Crawford. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.
- Denaux, Adelbert. ‘L’hypocrisie des Pharisiens et le Dessein de Dieu. Analyse de Lc., XIII, 31-33.’ In *L’Évangile de Luc / The Gospel of Luke*, edited by Frans Neirynck, 155–195. Rev. and enlarged ed. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 32. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. ‘Further Light on the Narratives of the Nativity.’ *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975): 81–108.
- . ‘Herod’s Oath and the Baptist’s Head.’ *Biblische Zeitschrift* 9 (1965): 49–59.

- . ‘Luke’s Perspective on Tribute to Caesar.’ In *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, edited by Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper, 38–48. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1934.
- . ‘Herodes und Pilatus.’ *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums* 16 (1915): 113–126.
- . *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by Mary Ling. London: SCM Press, 1956.
- Dicken, Frank E. ‘Author and Date of Luke-Acts.’ In *Issues in Luke-Acts*, edited by Michael Pahl and Sean Adams, 7–26. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012.
- Dines, Jennifer M. *The Septuagint*. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *The Roman Antiquities Books 5-6.48*. Translated by Earnest Cary. Vol. 3. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library 357. London: William Heinemann, 1940.
- Dittenberger, Wilhelm, ed. *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Lipsiae: S. Hirzel, 1903.
- Doble, Peter. ‘The Psalms in Luke-Acts.’ In *The Psalms in the New Testament*, edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken, 83–118. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Docherty, Thomas. *Reading (Absent) Character: Towards a Theory of Characterization in Fiction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures*. London: Nisbet & Co., 1952.
- Dupont, Jacques. ‘L’interprétation des Psaumes.’ In *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, 283–307. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1967.
- . ‘Notes sur les Actes des Apôtres.’ *Revue Biblique* 62 (1955): 45–59.
- Ehrman, Bart D. ‘Cephas and Peter.’ *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 463–474.
- Elliott, J. K., ed. *The Apocryphal Jesus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- . *The Apocryphal New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- . ‘Te in the New Testament.’ *Theologische Zeitschrift* 46 (1990): 202–204.

- Esler, Philip F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Eusebius. *Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History Books 1-5*. Translated by J. E. L. Oulton. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library 153. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1942.
- Evans, Christopher Francis. *Saint Luke*. TPI New Testament Commentaries. London: SCM Press, 1990.
- Evans, Craig. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Study: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody: Hendricksen, 2005.
- . ‘King Jesus and His Ambassadors: Empire in Luke-Acts.’ In *Empire in the New Testament*, edited by Stanley Porter and Cynthia Long Westfall, 120–139. Eugene: Pickwick, 2011.
- . *Luke*. New International Biblical Commentary 3. Peabody: Hendricksen, 1990.
- Farley, F. A. ‘A Text (Luke xiii.33).’ *Expository Times* 34 (1922): 429–430.
- Feldman, Louis H. ‘Flavius Josephus Revisited: The Man, His Writings, and His Significance.’ In *Principat*, edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase, 2:763–862. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 21. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.
- . *Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary: Judean Antiquities 1-4*. Edited by Steve Mason. Vol. 3. Brill Josephus Project. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Filmer, W. E. ‘The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great.’ *Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (1966): 283–298.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Anchor Bible 31. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- . ‘The Composition of Luke, Chapter 9.’ In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, edited by Charles H. Talbert, 139–152. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978.
- . *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*. Anchor Bible 28. Garden City: Doubleday, 1981.
- . *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*. Anchor Bible 28a. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.
- . *Luke the Theologian*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989.

- Forster, E. M. *Aspects of the Novel*. London: Harcourt, 1955.
- Foster, Paul. *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary*. Texts and Editions for New Testament Study 4. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Foster, Ruth Ann, and William D. Shiell. 'The Parable of the Sower and the Seed.' *Review and Expositor* 94 (1997): 259–267.
- Fowl, Stephen. 'Simeon in Acts 15:14: The Voice of Simon Peter and Echoes of Simeons Past.' Unpublished paper, n.d.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Matthew*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Gallagher, Robert L. 'From "Doingness" to "Beingness": A Missiological Interpretation.' In *Mission in Acts*, edited by Robert L. Gallagher and Paul Hertig, 45–58. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 2004.
- Garrett, Susan. *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- . 'Exodus from Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1-24.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52 (1990): 656–680.
- Gaventa, Beverley Roberts. *Acts*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003.
- George, Augustin. 'Le parallèle entre Jean-Baptiste et Jésus en Luc 12.' In *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Bédard Rigaux*, edited by Albert Descamps and R. P. André de Halleux, 147–171. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.
- Gill, Christopher. 'The Character-Personality Distinction.' In *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, edited by Christopher Pelling, 1–31. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Goldhill, Simon. 'Character and Action, Representation and Reading: Greek Tragedy and Its Critics.' In *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, edited by Christopher Pelling, 100–127. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Good, Dierdre. 'Pistis Sophia.' In *Searching the Scriptures*, edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, 2:678–707. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1994.
- Gowler, David B. 'Characterization in Luke: A Socio-Narratological Approach.' *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 19 (1989): 54–62.
- Grant, Jamie. 'Singing the Cover Versions.' *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 25 (2007): 27–49.

- Grant, Michael. *Herod the Great*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1971.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- . ‘Internal Repetition in Luke-Acts: Contemporary Narratology and Lucan Historiography.’ In *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, edited by Ben Witherington III, 283–299. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . ‘Luke-Acts, or Luke and Acts? A Reaffirmation of Narrative Unity.’ In *Reading Acts Today: Essays in Honour of Loveday C. A. Alexander*, edited by Steve Walton, Thomas E. Phillips, Lloyd K. Pietersen, and F. Scott Spencer, 101–119. Library of New Testament Studies 427. London: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Green, Joel B., and Michael McKeever. *Luke-Acts & New Testament Historiography*. IBR Bibliographies. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1995.
- Gregory, Andrew. ‘The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts.’ *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29 (2007): 459–472.
- . ‘The Reception of Luke and Acts and the Unity of Luke-Acts.’ In *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, edited by Andrew Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, 82–96. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010.
- . *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum neuen Testament II 169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Gregory, Andrew, and C. Kavin Rowe, eds. *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010.
- Gressmann, Hugo, and Erich Klostermann. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.
- Hahn, Ferdinand. *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*. Translated by Harold Knight and George Ogg. London: Camelot Press, 1969.
- Halliwell, Stephen. ‘Traditional Greek Conceptions of Character.’ In *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, edited by Christopher Pelling, 32–59. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

- Harlé, Paul André. 'Un "Private-Joke" de Paul dans le Livre des Acts (26:28-29).' *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 527–533.
- Harrell, Pat Edwin. "'Almost Persuaded" Now to Believe - Acts 26:28.' *Restoration Quarterly* 4 (1960): 252–254.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina 1. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Harry, J. E. 'Agrippa's Response to Paul (Acts 26.28).' *The Classical Review* 22 (1908): 238–241.
- Haskins, Susan. *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor*. London: Harper Collins, 1993.
- Hengel, Martin. *Saint Peter: The Underestimated Apostle*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Hock, Ronald F. *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas*. The Scholars Bible. Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 1995.
- Hoehner, Harold W. 'The Date of the Death of Herod the Great.' In *Chronos Kairos Christos*, edited by Jerry Vardaman and Edwin Yamauchi, 101–112. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1989.
- . *Herod Antipas: A Contemporary of Jesus Christ*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980.
- . 'Why Did Pilate Hand Jesus over to Antipas?' In *The Trial of Jesus: Cambridge Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule*, edited by Ernst Bammel, 84–90. *Studies in Biblical Theology* 13. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- Holmas, Geir Otto. *Prayer and Vindication in Luke-Acts*. Library of New Testament Studies 433. London: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Hurtado, Larry. *Lord Jesus Christ*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003.
- James, Montague Rhodes. *Apocrypha Anecdota*. Vol. 5. Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897.
- Jensen, Morten Hørning. *Herod Antipas in Galilee*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum neuen Testament 215. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- . 'Josephus and Antipas: A Case Study of Josephus' Narratives on Herod Antipas.' In *Making History: Josephus and Historical Method*, edited by Zuleika Rodgers, 289–312. *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 110. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

- Jervell, Jacob. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- . *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. Theology of the New Testament. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Johnson, Luke T. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sacra Pagina 5. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- . ‘Literary Criticism of Luke-Acts: Is Reception History Pertinent?’ In *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, edited by Andrew Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, 66–69. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010.
- . ‘The Lukan Kingship Parable (Lk. 19:11-27).’ *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982): 139–159.
- . *Luke*. Sacra Pagina 3. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Jones, A. H. M. *The Herods of Judaea*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Jones, Donald L. ‘Luke’s Interest in Historical Chronology.’ In *SBL Seminar Papers 1989*, 378–387. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities Books 14-15*. Translated by Ralph Marcus and Allen Wikgren. Vol. 10. 13 vols. Loeb Classical Library 489. London: William Heinemann, 1943.
- . *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities Books 16-17*. Translated by Ralph Marcus and Allen Wikgren. Vol. 11. 13 vols. Loeb Classical Library 410. London: William Heinemann, 1963.
- . *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities Books 18-19*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. Vol. 12. 13 vols. Loeb Classical Library 433. London: William Heinemann, 1965.
- . *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities Book 20*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. Vol. 13. 13 vols. Loeb Classical Library 456. London: William Heinemann, 1965.
- . *Josephus: The Jewish War Books 1-2*. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray. Vol. 2. 13 vols. Loeb Classical Library 203. London: William Heinemann, 1956.
- . *Josephus: The Jewish War Books 3-4*. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray. Vol. 3. 13 vols. Loeb Classical Library 487. London: William Heinemann, 1957.

- . *Josephus: The Jewish War Books 5-7*. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray. Vol. 4. 13 vols. Loeb Classical Library 210. London: William Heinemann, 1971.
- . *Josephus: The Life, Against Apion*. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray. Vol. 1. 13 vols. Loeb Classical Library 186. London: William Heinemann, 1961.
- Joüon, Paul. 'Luk 23,11: Ἐσθῆτα Λαμπάν.' *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 26 (1936): 80–85.
- Karris, Robert J. *Luke, Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account as Literature*. Theological Inquiries. Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1985.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary (Introduction and 1:1-2:47)*. Vol. 1. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Kermode, Frank. *The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative*. London: Harvard University, 1979.
- Kilgallen, John J. 'Paul before Agrippa (Acts 26,2-23): Some Considerations.' *Biblica* 69 (1988): 170–195.
- Kim, Seyoon. *Christ and Caesar: The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the Writings of Paul and Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Kodell, Jerome. 'The Word of God Grew: The Ecclesial Tendency of Λόγος in Acts 1,7; 12,24; 19,20.' *Biblica* 55 (1974): 505–519.
- Kokkinos, Nikos. *The Herodian Dynasty*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 30. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- . 'Which Salome Did Aristobulus Marry?' *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 118 (1986): 33–50.
- Kraemer, Ross. 'Ber(e)nice.' In *Women in Scripture*, edited by Carol Meyers, 59–61. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Krauss, Samuel. *Antoninus und Rabbi*. Jahresbericht der Israelitisch-Theologischen XVII. Wien: Verlag der Israel-Theol. Lehranstalt, 1910.
- Kruse, Heinz. 'Das Reich Satans.' *Biblica* 58 (1977): 29–61.
- Kurz, William S. *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.

- Lake, Kirsopp. 'Simon, Cephas, Peter.' *Harvard Theological Review* 1921 (1921): 95–97.
- Landau, Tamar. *Out-Heroding Herod. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 63. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Lawrence, John. 'Publius Sulpicius Quirinius and the Syrian Census.' *Restoration Quarterly* 34 (1992): 193–205.
- Lee, Jae Won. 'Pilate and the Crucifixion of Jesus in Luke-Acts.' In *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, edited by David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee, 84–106. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011.
- Lehtipuu, Outi. 'Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and the Poor Man in Luke 16.19-31.' In *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, edited by David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, 73–105. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th edition. Edited by Sir Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Lindner, Helgo. 'Eine offene Frage zur Auslegung des Bellum-Proömiums.' In *Josephus - Studien: Untersuchung zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem neuen Testament Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, edited by Otto Betz, Klaus Haacker, and Martin Hengel, 254–259. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Macurdy, Grace H. 'Julia Berenice.' *American Journal of Philology* 56 (1935): 246–253.
- Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. *Studies of the New Testament and its World*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982.
- Maier, Paul. 'The Date of the Nativity and the Chronology of Jesus' Life.' In *Chronos Kairos Christos*, edited by Jerry Vardaman and Edwin Yamauchi, 113–132. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1989.
- Malherbe, Abraham. "'Not in a Corner': Early Christian Apologetic in Acts 26:26." *The Second Century* 5 (86 1985): 193–210.

- Manson, T. W. *The Sayings of Jesus*. London: SCM Press, 1949.
- Marcos, Natalio Fernandez. *The Septuagint in Context*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Marcus, Joel. *Mark 1-8*. Anchor Bible 27. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Marguerat, Daniel. *The First Christian Historian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Marjanen, Antti. 'The Mother of Jesus or the Magdalene? The Identity of Mary in the So-Called Gnostic Christian Texts.' In *Which Mary?*, edited by F. Stanley Jones, 31–42. SBL Symposium Series 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *Acts*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1980.
- . *Commentary on Luke*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martin, Ernest L. 'The Nativity and Herod's Death.' In *Chronos Kairos Christos*, edited by Jerry Vardaman and Edwin Yamauchi, 85–92. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1989.
- Mason, Steve. *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees: A Composition-Critical Study*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991.
- . *Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary: Judean War 2*. Vol. 1b. Brill Josephus Project. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . *Josephus and the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Peabody: Hendricksen, 2003.
- . 'Should Any Wish to Enquire Further (Ant. 1.25): The Aim and Audience of Josephus' Judean Antiquities/Life.' In *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives*, edited by Steve Mason, 64–103. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 32. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Matera, Frank. *The Kingship of Jesus*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 66. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982.
- . 'Luke 23,1-25. Jesus before Pilate, Herod, and Israel.' In *L'Évangile de Luc / The Gospel of Luke*, edited by Frans Neirynck, 535–551. Rev. and enlarged ed. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 32. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.
- Matthews, Christopher R. *Philip: Apostle and Evangelist*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 105. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

- Mattill, Jr., A. J. 'The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H. H. Evans Reconsidered.' *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975): 15–46.
- Meshorer, Ya'akov. 'A Stone Weight from the Reign of Herod.' *Israel Exploration Journal* 20 (1970): 97–98.
- . *Ancient Jewish Coinage: Herod the Great through Bar Cochba*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. New York: Amphora, 1982.
- . *A Treasury of Jewish Coins*. Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2001.
- Metzger, Bruce. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 2002.
- Miesner, Donald. 'The Missionary Journeys Narrative: Patterns and Implications.' In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, edited by Charles H. Talbert, 199–214. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978.
- Minear, Paul. 'Luke's Use of Birth Stories.' In *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, 111–130. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Moessner, David P. 'The Christ Must Suffer: New Light on the Jesus - Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts.' *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986): 220–256.
- . '"Listening Posts" Along the Way: "Synchronisms" as Metaleptic Prompts to the "Continuity of the Narrative" in Polybius' Histories and in Luke's Gospel-Acts. A Tribute to David E. Aune.' In *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context*, edited by John Fotopoulos, 129–150. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 122. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Moltmann-Wendel, Elisabeth. *The Women Around Jesus*. Translated by John Bowden. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Moore, Stephen D. *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge*. London: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Moss, Candida. *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- Moule, H. W. 'Acts iv.25.' *Expository Times* 51 (1940): 396.
- Moyise, Steve. *The Old Testament in the New Testament*. T&T Clark Approaches to Biblical Studies. London: Continuum, 2001.

- Neagoe, Alexandru. *The Trial of the Gospel: An Apologetic Reading of Luke's Trial Narrative*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 116. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. 'Luke's Social Location of Paul: Cultural Anthropology and the Status of Paul in Acts.' In *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, edited by Ben Witherington III, 251–282. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 1:1–9:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 35a. Waco: Word, 1989.
- . *Luke 9:21–18:34*. Word Biblical Commentary 35b. Waco: Word, 1993.
- . *Luke 18:35–24:53*. Word Biblical Commentary 35c. Waco: Word, 1993.
- Novenson, Matthew V. *Christ Among the Messiahs: Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- O'Brien, P. T. 'Prayer in Luke-Acts.' *Tyndale Bulletin* 24 (1973): 111–127.
- O'Neill, J. C. 'The Silence of Jesus.' *New Testament Studies* 15 (1968): 153–167.
- O'Toole, Robert F. *Acts 26: The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense (Ac 22:1–26:32)*. *Analecta Biblica* 78. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- . 'Luke's Message in Luke 9:1–50.' *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987): 74–89.
- . 'Luke's Position on Politics and Society in Luke-Acts.' In *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, edited by Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper, 1–17. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.
- . *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts*. Good News Studies 9. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984.
- Omerzu, Heike. 'Das Traditionsgeschichtliche Verhältnis der Begegnungen von Jesus mit Herodes Antipas und Paulus mit Agrippa II.' *Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* 28 (2003): 121–145.
- . *Der Prozess des Paulus: eine exegetische und rechtshistorische Untersuchung der Apostelgeschichte*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 115. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.
- Otzen, Benedikt. *Tobit and Judith*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

- Parker, Pierson. 'Herod Antipas and the Death of Jesus.' In *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church*, edited by E. P. Sanders, 197–208. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Parry, David. 'Release of the Captives: Reflections on Acts 12.' In *Luke's Literary Achievement*, edited by C. M. Tuckett, 156–164. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 116. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. *Acts*. Paideia. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- Parsons, Mikeal C., and Richard I. Pervo. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Patrich, Joseph. *Studies in the Archaeology and History of Caesarea Maritima: Caput Judaeae, Metropolis Palaestinae*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Pelling, Christopher. 'Conclusion.' In *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, edited by Christopher Pelling, 245–262. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Penner, Archie. *The Christian, the State, and the New Testament*. Scottsdale: Herald Press, 1959.
- Perowne, Stewart. *The Later Herods*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1958.
- . *The Life and Times of Herod the Great*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1957.
- Pervo, Richard I. *Acts*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.
- . *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 2006.
- Pesch, Rudolph. *Die Apostelgeschichte (Apg 1-12)*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar 5.1. Köln: Neukirchener, 1986.
- . *Die Apostelgeschichte (Apg 13-28)*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar 5.2. Köln: Neukirchener, 1986.
- Petersen, Norman R. *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.
- Philo. *Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson. Vol. 9. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library 363. London: William Heinemann, 1985.
- . *Philo: The Embassy to Gaius*. Translated by F. H. Colson. Vol. 10. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library 379. London: Harvard University Press, 1962.

- Pickett, Raymond. 'Luke and Empire: An Introduction.' In *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, edited by David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee, 1–22. Eugene: Pickwick, 2011.
- Pilgrim, Walter E. *Uneasy Neighbors: Church and State in the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. 5th ed. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1901.
- Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives: Agesilaus and Pompey, Pelopidas and Marcellus*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Vol. 5. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library 87. London: William Heinemann, 1955.
- . *Plutarch's Lives: Demetrius and Antony, Pyrrhus and Caius Marius*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Vol. 9. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library 101. London: William Heinemann, 1959.
- . *Plutarch's Lives: Demosthenes and Cicero, Alexander and Caesar*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Vol. 7. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library 99. London: William Heinemann, 1967.
- . *Plutarch's Lives: Themistocles and Camillus, Aristides and Cato Major, Cimon and Lucullus*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. Vol. 2. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library 47. London: William Heinemann, 1968.
- . *Plutarch's Moralia*. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. Vol. 3. 15 vols. Loeb Classical Library 245. London: William Heinemann, 1961.
- Powell, Mark Allen. *What Is Narrative Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Praeder, Susan Marie. 'Jesus-Paul, Peter-Paul, and Jesus-Peter Parallelisms in Luke-Acts: A History of Reader Response.' In *SBL Seminar Papers 1984*, 23–40. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984.
- Rapske, Brian. *Paul in Roman Custody. The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Ravens, D. A. S. 'Luke 9:7-62 and the Prophetic Role of Jesus.' *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 119–129.
- Reid, Barbara. 'Women Prophets of God's Alternative Reign.' In *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, edited by David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee, 44–59. Eugene: Pickwick, 2011.
- Rese, Martin. 'Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas.' Doktorwürde, Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1965.

- Resseguie, James. *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Rhoads, David. 'Narrative Criticism: Practices and Prospects.' In *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, edited by David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, 264–285. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Rhoads, David, and Donald Michie. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Richardson, Peter. *Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996.
- Riddle, Donald W. 'The Cephas-Peter Problem, and a Possible Solution.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 59 (1940): 169–180.
- Riesner, Rainer. 'James's Speech (Acts 15:13-21), Simeon's Hymn (Luke 2:29-32), and Luke's Sources.' In *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*, edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 263–279. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1994.
- Rimaud, Didier. 'La Première Prière Liturgique.' *La Maison Dieu* 51 (1957): 99–115.
- Robbins, Vernon K. 'Luke-Acts: A Mixed Population Seeks a Home in the Roman Empire.' In *Images of Empire*, edited by Loveday Alexander, 202–221. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Robinson, Forbes. *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*. Vol. 2. Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 4. London: Cambridge University Press, 1896.
- Rocca, Samuel. *Herod's Judaea: A Mediterranean State in the Classical World*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 122. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Rodgers, Zuleika. 'Monarchy vs. Priesthood: Josephus, Justus of Tiberias, and Agrippa II.' In *A Wandering Galilean: Essays in Honour of Sean Freyne*, edited by Zuleika Rodgers, Margaret Daly-Denton, and Anne Fitzpatrick McKinley, 173–184. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Rowe, C. Kavin. *Early Narrative Christology*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 139. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- . 'History, Hermeneutics and the Unity of Luke-Acts.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (2005): 131–157.

- . ‘Literary Unity and Reception History.’ In *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, edited by Andrew Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, 74–81. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010.
- . ‘Literary Unity and Reception History: Reading Luke-Acts as Luke and Acts.’ *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29 (2007): 449–457.
- . ‘Luke-Acts and the Imperial Cult: A Way Through the Conundrum.’ *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27 (2003): 279–300.
- . *World Upside Down*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Sack, Ronald. *Images of Nebuchadnezzar: The Emergence of a Legend*. 2nd rev. and exp. ed. London: Associated University Presses, 2004.
- Salmon, George. *A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*. 4th ed. London: John Murray, 1889.
- Sanders, E. P. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Sanders, Jack T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. London: SCM Press, 1987.
- Schaberg, Jane. *The Resurrection of Mary Magdalene: Legends, Apocrypha, and the Christian Testament*. London: Continuum, 2002.
- Schaefer, Konrad. *Psalms*. Berit Olam. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Schalit, Abraham. *König Herodes: der Mann und sein Werk*. 2. Auflage mit einem Vorwort von Daniel R. Schwartz. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.
- Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, and R. McL. Wilson, eds. *New Testament Apocrypha: Gospels and Related Writings*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Rev. ed. London: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Scholes, Robert, James Phelan, and Robert Kellogg. *The Nature of Narrative*. Fortieth Anniversary Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Schramm, Tim. *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Schubert, Paul. ‘The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts.’ *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87 (1968): 1–16.
- Schwartz, Daniel. *Agrippa I: The Last King of Judaea*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 23. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990.

- . ‘Herodians and Ioudaioi in Flavian Rome.’ In *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, edited by Jonathan Edmondson, Steve Mason, and James Rives, 63–78. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Schwartz, Seth. *Josephus and Judaeon Politics*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition XVII. Leiden: Brill, 1990.
- Seim, Turid Karlsen. *The Double Message*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- Sherwin-White, A. N. *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Shoemaker, Stephen J. ‘A Case of Mistaken Identity? Naming the Gnostic Mary.’ In *Which Mary?*, edited by F. Stanley Jones, 5–30. Symposium Series 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Shutt, R. J. H. *Studies in Josephus*. London: SPCK, 1961.
- Sim, David C. ‘The Woman Followers of Jesus: The Implications of Luke 8:1-3.’ *Heythrop Journal* 30 (1989): 51–62.
- Skinner, Christopher W., and Kelly Iverson, eds. *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Skinner, Matthew L. *Locating Paul: Places of Custody as Narrative Settings in Acts 21-28*. Academia Biblica 13. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. *The Jews Under Roman Rule : from Pompey to Diocletian : a Study in Political Relations*. 2nd ed. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 20. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Smith, D. M. ‘Luke 1:26-38.’ *Interpretation* 29 (1975): 411–417.
- Smothers, Edgar R. ‘Chrysostom and Symeon (Acts XV, 14).’ *Harvard Theological Review* 46 (1953): 203–215.
- Soards, Marion L. ‘Herod Antipas’ Hearing in Luke 23.8.’ *The Bible Translator* 37 (1986): 146–147.
- . ‘The Silence of Jesus before Herod: An Interpretive Suggestion.’ *Australian Biblical Review* 33 (1985): 41–45.
- . *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994.
- . ‘Tradition, Composition, and Theology in Luke’s Account of Jesus Before Herod.’ *Biblica* 66 (1985): 344–364.

- Sordi, Marta. *The Christians and the Roman Empire*. Translated by Annabel Bedini. London: Croom Helm, 1983.
- Spencer, F. Scott. *Journeying through Acts: A Literary-Cultural Reading*. Peabody: Hendricksen, 2004.
- . ‘The Narrative of Luke-Acts: Getting to Know the Savior God.’ In *Issues in Luke-Acts*, edited by Michael Pahl and Sean Adams, 121–146. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012.
- . *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study in Roles and Relations*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 67. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Spencer, Patrick E. *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories of the Lukan Galilean Ministry Speeches: Hermeneutical Appropriation by Authorial Readers of Luke-Acts*. Library of New Testament Studies 341. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Stanton, Graham. ‘Message and Miracles.’ In *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus*, edited by Markus Bockmuehl, 56–71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Steinmann, Andrew E. ‘When Did Herod the Great Reign?’ *Novum Testamentum* 51 (2009): 1–29.
- Sterling, Gregory E. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 64. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1992.
- Stern, Menahem. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Vol. 1: From Herodotus to Plutarch. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974.
- . *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Vol. 2: From Tacitus to Simplicius. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980.
- Strabo of Amaseia. *The Geography of Strabo Books 10-12*. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Vol. 5. 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library 211. London: William Heinemann, 1961.
- . *The Geography of Strabo Books 15-16*. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Vol. 7. 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library 241. London: William Heinemann, 1930.

- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 110. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Swete, H. B. 'The Prophets in the Christian Church.' *The Biblical World* 26 (1905): 202–214.
- Tajra, Harry W. *The Trial of St. Paul*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum neuen Testament II 35. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1989.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. SBL Monograph Series 20. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
- . *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Rev. ed. Reading the New Testament. Macon: Smyth & Helwys Publishers, 2005.
- . *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1988.
- Tannehill, Robert C. 'The Composition of Acts 3-5: Narrative Development and Echo Effect.' In *SBL Seminar Papers 1984*, 217–240. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984.
- . *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- . *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1990.
- . 'The Narrator's Strategy in the Scenes of Paul's Defense.' *Forum* 8 (1992): 255–269.
- Taylor, Nicolas H. 'The Temptation of Jesus on the Mountain: A Palestinian Christian Polemic Against Agrippa I.' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 83 (2001): 27–49.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. *Josephus: The Man and the Historian*. New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1929.
- Thatcher, Tom, and Stephen D. Moore, eds. *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Thompson, Alan J. *One Lord, One People: The Unity of the Church in Acts in Its Literary Setting*. Library of New Testament Studies 359. London: T & T Clark, 2008.

- Tiede, David L. *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Trites, Allison A. 'The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts.' *Novum Testamentum* 16 (1974): 278–284.
- Tyson, Joseph B. 'The Birth Narratives and the Beginning of Luke's Gospel.' *Semeia* 52 (1990): 103–120.
- . *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Charleston: University of South Carolina Press, 1986.
- . 'Jesus and Herod Antipas.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960): 239–246.
- . 'The Lukan Version of the Trial of Jesus.' *Novum Testamentum* 3 (1959): 249–258.
- Unnik, W. C. Van. 'The 'Book of Acts': The Confirmation of the Gospel.' *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 26–59.
- Van Cangh, Jean-Marie. 'La Femme dans l'Évangile de Luc.' *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 24 (1993): 297–324.
- Varrall, A. W. 'Christ Before Herod: Luke xxiii 1-16.' *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1909): 321–353.
- Via, E. Jane. 'According to Luke, Who Put Jesus to Death?' In *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*, edited by Richard J. Cassidy and Philip Scharper, 146–167. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1983.
- Vinson, Richard B. 'The Minas Touch: Anti-Kingship Rhetoric in the Gospel of Luke.' *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 35 (2008): 69–86.
- Von Wahlde, Urban C. 'Acts 4,24-31: The Prayer of the Apostles in Response to the Persecution of Peter and John - and Its Consequences.' *Biblica* 77 (1996): 237–244.
- . 'The Problems of Acts 4:25a: A New Proposal.' *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 86 (1995): 265–267.
- . 'The Theological Assessment of the First Christian Persecution: The Apostles' Prayer and Its Consequences in Acts 4,24-31.' *Biblica* 76 (1995): 523–531.

- Walasky, Paul W. *And So We Came to Rome: The Political Perspective of St. Luke*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- . ‘The Trial and Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke.’ *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 81–93.
- Wall, Robert W. ‘Acts.’ In *Acts - 1 Corinthians*, edited by Leander E. Keck, *et al.* New Interpreter’s Bible X. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002.
- . ‘Successors to ‘the Twelve’ According to Acts 12:1-17.’ *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53 (1991): 628–643.
- Walton, Steve. ‘The State They Were In: Luke’s View of the Roman Empire.’ In *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*, edited by Peter Oakes, 1–41. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002.
- . ‘Trying Paul or Trying Rome?’ In *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, edited by David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee, 122–141. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011.
- . ‘What Does ‘Mission’ in Acts Mean in Relation to the ‘Powers That Be’?’ *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 55 (2012): 537–556.
- Weaver, John B. *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 131. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Webb, Robert L. *John the Baptizer and Prophet*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 62. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Weinart, Francis D. ‘Luke, the Temple and Jesus’ Saying About Jerusalem’s Abandoned House (Luke 13:34-35).’ *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 68–76.
- Wengst, Klaus. *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1987.
- Weren, Wim. ‘Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts: An Intertextual Study.’ In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*, edited by Sipke Draisma, 189–204. Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok, 1989.
- Wink, Walter. *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Witherington III, Ben. ‘On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and Other Disciples - Lk 8:1-3.’ *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 70 (1979): 243–248.

- . *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.
- . *Women in the Ministry of Jesus: A Study of Jesus' Attitudes to Women and Their Roles as Reflected in His Earthly Life*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Wolf, Wirgin. *Herod Agrippa I*. Vol. 6. Leeds University Oriental Society Monograph Series 10a, 10b. Leeds: Leeds University Oriental Society, 1968.
- Wolter, Michael. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Handbuch zum neuen Testament 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Yamazaki-Ransom, Kazuhiko. 'Paul, Agrippa I, and Antiochus IV: Two Persecutors in Light of 2 Maccabees 9.' In *Luke-Acts and Empire: Essays in Honor of Robert L. Brawley*, edited by David Rhoads, David Esterline, and Jae Won Lee, 107–121. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011.
- . *The Roman Empire in Luke's Narrative*. Library of New Testament Studies 404. London: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. 'Herod: A Malevolent Maniac.' *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 54 (1963): 1–27.
- . 'The Dates of the Birth and Crucifixion of Jesus. The Crucifixion, a Libelous Accusation Against the Jews.' *Jewish Quarterly Review* 55 (1964): 1–22.
- Ziesler, J. A. 'Luke and the Pharisees.' *New Testament Studies* 25 (1979): 146–157.